

The Signs of the Times, vol. 10

ESR

Ellet Joseph Waggoner

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
1884	6
January 3, 1884	6
"The Sabbath-School. 2 Corinthians 7-11:3" The Signs of the Times, 10, 1.	6
January 10, 1884	12
"The Sabbath-School. 2 Corinthians, Chaps. 11-13" The Signs of the Times, 10, 2.	12
January 31, 1884	18
"General Meeting at Healdsburg" The Signs of the Times, 10, 5.	18
February 28, 1884	22
"A Humiliating Confession" The Signs of the Times, 10, 9.	22
March 13, 1884	24
"Progress of the Work at Healdsburg" The Signs of the Times, 10, 11.	24
March 20, 1884	26
"The Support of the Poor" The Signs of the Times, 10, 12.	26
March 27, 1884	29
"Systematic Giving" The Signs of the Times, 10, 13.	29
April 3, 1884	34
"Systematic Giving. (Concluded.)" The Signs of the Times, 10, 14.	34
May 1, 1884	37
"Reasons for Not Observing Saturday" The Signs of the Times, 10, 17.	37
May 8, 1884	43
"General Meeting in Oakland" The Signs of the Times, 10, 1. The Signs of the Times, 10, 18.	43
May 22, 1884	47
"Los Angeles Camp-Meeting" The Signs of the Times, 10, 20.	47
May 29, 1884	49
"Southern California Camp-Meeting" The Signs of the Times, 10, 21.	49
June 5, 1884	50
"The Sabbath-School. Acts, Chapter 20:24-27:14" The Signs of the Times, 10, 22.	50
"Romans 13:1-10" The Signs of the Times, 10, 22.	53
"Our Sabbath-School Department" The Signs of the Times, 10, 22.	55
June 12, 1884	57
"God's Seventh Day Man's First Day" The Signs of the Times, 10, 23.	57
"Facts Against Supposition" The Signs of the Times, 10, 23.	59
June 19, 1884	63
"The Sabbath-School. Acts, Chapter 28" The Signs of the Times, 10, 24.	63
"An Important Question" The Signs of the Times, 10, 24.	65
June 26, 1884	70
"2 Samuel 6:1-12" The Signs of the Times, 10, 25.	70
"Nature of the Law" The Signs of the Times, 10, 25.	73
"The Seventh Day Is the Sabbath" The Signs of the Times, 10, 25.	76
"The Foundation of Spiritualism" The Signs of the Times, 10, 25.	80
"A Want Not Gratified" The Signs of the Times, 10, 25.	81
July 3, 1884	83
"2 Samuel 7:1-16" The Signs of the Times, 10, 26.	83

“Condemned and Justified” The Signs of the Times, 10, 26.	85
“The Promise of His Coming” The Signs of the Times, 10, 26.	89
July 17, 1884	94
“The Sabbath-School” The Signs of the Times, 10, 27.	94
LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JULY 16	94
LESSON FOR AUGUST 2	96
“A New Creature in Christ” The Signs of the Times, 10, 27.	100
“Manner of Christ’s Coming” The Signs of the Times, 10, 27.	104
“Some Modern Criticism” The Signs of the Times, 10, 27.	107
“The Sabbath-School” The Signs of the Times, 10, 27.	111
LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST.—AUG. 9	111
July 24, 1884	117
“Object of Christ’s Coming” The Signs of the Times, 10, 28.	117
“Christ the End of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 10, 28.	120
July 31, 1884	125
“The Sabbath-School” The Signs of the Times, 10, 29.	125
LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—AUG. 16	125
“The Reason Why” The Signs of the Times, 10, 29.	131
August 7, 1884	136
“The Sabbath-School” The Signs of the Times, 10, 30.	136
LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—AUG. 23	136
“Christ the End of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 10, 30.	140
August 14, 1884	145
“The Sabbath-School” The Signs of the Times, 10, 31.	145
LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—SEPT. 6	145
August 21, 1884	152
“The Sabbath-School” The Signs of the Times, 10, 32.	152
LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—SEPT. 13	152
“The Resurrection” The Signs of the Times, 10, 32.	158
“Relation of the Law and Grace” The Signs of the Times, 10, 32.	162
August 28, 1884	173
“The Sabbath-School” The Signs of the Times, 10, 33.	173
LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—SEPT. 20	173
“Under the Law” The Signs of the Times, 10, 33.	177
“Spiritualistic Theology” The Signs of the Times, 10, 33.	182
“Eternal Life” The Signs of the Times, 10, 33.	184
September 4, 1884	189
“The Sabbath-School” The Signs of the Times, 10, 34.	189
LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—SEPT. 27	189
“Under the Law (Continued.)” The Signs of the Times, 10, 34.	194
“Immortality” The Signs of the Times, 10, 34.	198
September 11, 1884	203
“How Will They Do It?” The Signs of the Times, 10, 35.	203
“Under the Law. (Continued.)” The Signs of the Times, 10, 35.	205
September 18, 1884	212
“The Sabbath-School” The Signs of the Times, 10, 36.	212
LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—OCT. 11	212
“Shaking of the Powers of Heaven” The Signs of the Times, 10, 36.	217
“Under the Law. (Concluded.)” The Signs of the Times, 10, 36.	219
October 2, 1884	225
“The Sabbath-School” The Signs of the Times, 10, 37.	225

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—OCT. 18	225
LESSON FOR OCTOBER 25	226
"Is a State Religion Contemplated?" The Signs of the Times, 10, 37.	232
October 9, 1884	239
"The Sabbath-School" The Signs of the Times, 10, 38.	239
LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—OCT. 25	239
"Seventh-day Keepers and the Teaching of the Apostles" The Signs of the Times, 10, 38.	246
October 16, 1884	246
"The Teaching of the Apostles" The Signs of the Times, 10, 39.	246
October 23, 1884	251
"The Sabbath-School" The Signs of the Times, 10, 40.	251
LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—NOV. 9	251
"The Teaching of the Apostles" The Signs of the Times, 10, 40.	255
CHARACTER OF EARLY WRITINGS IN GENERAL	255
"What Constitutes a Christian?" The Signs of the Times, 10, 40.	258
October 30, 1884	263
"The Sabbath-School" The Signs of the Times, 10, 41.	263
LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—NOV. 22	263
"The Teaching of the Apostles" The Signs of the Times, 10, 41.	267
COMPANY IN WHICH IT WAS FOUND	267
"The Mission of Christ" The Signs of the Times, 10, 41.	272
November 6, 1884	278
"The Sabbath-School" The Signs of the Times, 10, 42.	278
LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—NOV. 29	278
"Everlasting Fire" The Signs of the Times, 10, 42.	283
"The Teaching of the Apostles" The Signs of the Times, 10, 42.	288
"A Mixed Case" The Signs of the Times, 10, 42.	291
November 13, 1884	295
"The Sabbath-School" The Signs of the Times, 10, 43.	295
LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—DEC. 6	295
"Everlasting Punishment" The Signs of the Times, 10, 43.	300
"The Lord's Day" The Signs of the Times, 10, 43.	303
CONSIDERATION OF THE ARGUMENT FROM THE PRACTICE OF THE EARLY CHURCH	303
November 20, 1884	307
"The Sabbath-School" The Signs of the Times, 10, 44.	307
LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—DEC. 13	307
"Punishment of the Wicked" The Signs of the Times, 10, 44.	312
"FOREVER AND EVER"	312
"The Lord's Day" The Signs of the Times, 10, 44.	317
November 27, 1884	322
"Helps in Studying the Lesson" The Signs of the Times, 10, 45.	322
"Good Advice for Sabbath-Schools" The Signs of the Times, 10, 45.	324
"The Lord's Day." (Continued.) The Signs of the Times, 10, 45.	326
December 4, 1884	330
"The Sabbath-School" The Signs of the Times, 10, 46.	330
LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—DEC. 20	330
LESSON FOR DECEMBER 27	332
"The Salvation Army" The Signs of the Times, 10, 46.	337
"The Lord's Day. (Continued.)" The Signs of the Times, 10, 46.	342
December 11, 1884	346
"Ancient Spiritualism. Saul and the Witch" The Signs of the Times, 10, 47.	346
SAUL AND THE WITCH	346

"The Lord's Day. (Continued.)" The Signs of the Times, 10, 47.	352
"Who Is Responsible?" The Signs of the Times, 10, 47.	355
December 18, 1884	359
"The Sabbath-School. Spiritualism" The Signs of the Times, 10, 48.	359
"The Lord's Day. (Concluded.)" The Signs of the Times, 10, 48.	363
"Punishment of the Wicked" The Signs of the Times, 10, 48.	369
DIRECT TESTIMONY	369

1884

January 3, 1884

“The Sabbath-School. *2 Corinthians 7-11:3*” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST-JAN. 12.

2 Corinthians 7-11:3.

THE GRACE OF GIVING.

The eighth and ninth chapters of Paul's second letter to the Corinthian church, contain instruction in regard to the necessity and blessedness of contributing to the support of the cause of God, and especially of ministering to the necessity of the saints. The apostle had been requested by the elders at Jerusalem to remember the poor “which,” he says, “I also was forward to do.” *Galatians 2:10*. In his first epistle he gave the Corinthians the same directions for making a collection for the poor that he had previously given to the churches in Galatia, and now he writes to stir them up to activity in this respect. In the seventh chapter he had admirably paved the way for the introduction of this subject. Having commended them for the readiness with which they had accepted his reproof, he closed with the words, “I rejoice therefore that I have confidence in you in all things.” Paul never descended to flattery, but he knew that by an honest expression of his confidence he could deepen his influence with the church. *SITI January 3, 1884, page 6.1*

The subject so near to the heart of the apostle is introduced thus: “Moreover, brethren, we do you to wit of [*i.e.*, we make known to you] the grace of God bestowed on the churches of Macedonia; how that in a great trial of affliction the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality.” Paul does not mean that the Macedonians gave large sums for their deep poverty would make that an impossibility. He means that God had enabled them to give according to their means, and even beyond it, as is stated in *verse 3*. This was the grace which God bestowed upon them. Selfishness is natural to the human heart,

and has two opposite effects,-it finds its possessor, and also enlarges his vision. It makes him blind as to his ability to do good, causing him to think that his means are not sufficient to allow of his giving more than a trifle; and it magnifies his little offerings, so that he imagines that he has given far beyond his means, and is exceedingly generous. The work of the Spirit of God is to remove this selfishness by helping us to see things just as they are,-to realize what a priceless gift has been bestowed upon us, and how undeserving we are.*SITI January 3, 1884, page 6.2*

The ability to give, then, is a special gift of God. Paul says: "Therefore as ye abound in everything, in faith, and utterance, and knowledge, and in all diligence, and in your love to us, see that ye abound in this grace also." We often hear people wish that they had wealth, so that they could give liberally to the poor, or to the cause of God. Now while it is true that prosperity comes from God, and it is he that has power to get wealth, this is not the gift of which the apostle speaks. What the class just referred to ought to earnestly long for, is not means, but the grace to give according to that which they already possess. The Macedonians were exceedingly poor, yet God gave them grace to give. In their case Paul did not have to do any urging; on the contrary, they urged him with much entreaty to accept the gift.*SITI January 3, 1884, page 6.3*

The fifth first gives the key to their liberality; they had first given *themselves* to the Lord. When a person realizes that he is not his own, and freely acknowledges the fact, giving will be an easy matter. In fact, giving freely will be the natural result of consecrating ourselves wholly to the Lord, so that the readiness with which we give to the cause of God indicates in a great degree the measure of our consecration to him. It may help us to understand this matter if we consider how the apostles regarded themselves. When they speak of themselves as servants of the Lord, they use the Greek word *doulos*, whose primary meaning is, a bondman, a slave. Literally, *Philippians 1:1* reads, "Paul and Timotheus, the slaves of Jesus Christ." Now a slave is not able to hold property in his own right; everything belongs to his master, and he himself cannot acquire a title to anything. It is in just this way that we should consider ourselves related to God. The only difference between earthly servants and masters is, that although we do belong to God,

whether we acknowledge it or not, we are not compelled to serve him. All our service must be voluntary. To be sure, in the end there will be a punishment for those to defraud the Master of his just dues; but on the other hand, there will be a glorious reward for those who simply restore that to which they have no right at all.*SITI January 3, 1884, page 6.4*

“For if there first be a willing mind, it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not.” No doubt many persons take great comfort from this text, for they repeatedly wish they could give, and therefore imagine that they are very acceptable to God. And as if to atone for their not giving anything, they usually wish to give very large sums. But this verse was written with the understanding that the individual had acquired the grace of giving according to his means. If all had this grace, all would give something, for very few are poorer than the widow who had only two mites for her support. When men give in this way, willingly, the gift is valued by the Lord, according to the proportion which it bears to the means of the giver. The poor widow’s gift was considered as greater than all the gifts of the rich men, because she gave more in proportion to her means.*SITI January 3, 1884, page 6.5*

This idea is carried out in the following verses. “For I mean not that other men should be eased and ye burden.” He did not design that a few should do all the giving, but that all should share in it. He meant that there should be an equality. This equality would be gained if each gave according to what he had.*SITI January 3, 1884, page 6.6*

“As it is written, He that had gathered much had nothing over; and he that had gathered little had no lack.” This quotation is from *Exodus 16:18*, and has reference to the gathering of the manna. The Israelites were allowed an omer for each individual. This was all that could possibly be used in one day. If one on account of superior activity gathered more, he was to divide it with one whose circumstances did not allow him to gather a sufficient quantity for his daily support. This begot a feeling of mutual sympathy among them, such a feeling as should exist among those who are members of the family of Christ.*SITI January 3, 1884, page 6.7*

The parallel that the apostle draws should be well considered. In their case the tendency to hoard up that which they had gathered more than their actual present need, would be checked by the knowledge that on the morrow another ample supply would be given. So in our cases, the same God who supplied them with manna is our Father, and knows that we have need of food and clothing. See *Matthew 6:30-34*. We are commanded to pray, "Give us this day our daily bread," and that command implies the fact that the prayer will be answered. *SITI January 3, 1884, page 6.8*

Again, those of the Jews who gathered more than they could use, and saved it for future need, had a mortifying check put upon their greed when they found their hoarded provision a mass of corruption. In our case the parallel still holds good, for however much property a man may acquire, he himself can use only a small part. As a certain millionaire said, when envied by a poor man, "You are as well off as I am, for all I get is my board and clothes." In other words, with all his wealth, he could no more than live. Then, too, riches often vanish in a moment. Nothing can be devised that will ensure a man's property from going as quickly as did the Israelites' hoarded manna. And whether this misfortune should come or not, the end will certainly come soon, and then that which is treasured up will, in many cases at least, be worse than nothing. See *James 5:1-3*. *SITI January 3, 1884, page 6.9*

That this mutual distribution of means is what Paul designed is shown by *verse 14*: "But by an equality, that now at this time your abundance may be a supply for their want, that there abundance also may be a supply for your want; that there may be equality." We can readily see that in the case of the Jews, such a course was the best one for them to pursue, since if they did lay up provision it would be to no profit, and by their accommodation to a needy friend, they would secure to themselves a like favor, should they be in similar circumstances. If we cannot as readily see that it is the best thing for Christians to do now, it is because we have not the faith in God that we should have, and are blind as to the future. *SITI January 3, 1884, page 6.10*

As we have already stated, Paul did not feel at liberty to make any commands in the matter of giving, but to appeal to their sense of

obligation, that what they gave might be a “as a matter of bounty,” and not something forced from covetous dispositions. One of his strong points is that he has boasted of the forwardness of the churches in Achaia, and had used their readiness in pledging as an incentive for others. Now, said he, if some persons should come with me from Macedonia, and find that you have done little or nothing, we would both be put to shame. The Macedonians will think that I have deceived them, and they will think slightly of you. We have here an instance of the remarkable tact which Paul exercised in dealing with the churches. *SITI January 3, 1884, page 6.11*

“But this I say, he which soweth sparingly shall reap all so sparingly, and he which soweth bountifully shall read also bountifully.” 2 *Corinthians* 9:6. From this text nothing more or less can be made than that our present welfare, at least, depends largely upon the cheerfulness with which we give. A study of *Luke 16:1-12* will convince us that our liberality is not an unimportant factor in determining our fitness for our future inheritance. Not that we can buy Heaven; but one who has not so vivid a sense of the magnitude of Christ’s sacrifice for him, that it will lead him to feel like following the same example, certainly has not much of the love of Christ in his heart. *SITI January 3, 1884, page 6.12*

The apostle continues: “And God is able to make all grace abound for you; that he always having all suffering in all things, may abound to every good work.” This is a plain statement that God is able to make that which they sow yield a bountiful harvest. How that will be accomplished is in part stated in *verses 12-14*: “For the administration of this service not only supplieth the want of the saints, but is abundant also by many thanksgivings unto God; while by the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your professed subjection unto the gospel of Christ, and for your liberal distribution unto them, and unto all men; and by their prayer for you, which long after you for the exceeding grace of God in you.” The idea is, that their service of love would produce abundant thanks to God, on the part of those who were benefited. It would also produce another result. It would move the saints to pray for their benefactors, and this would be of incalculable value to them. James says that the prayer of the righteous man avails much. The

amount of money given, if retained for their own use, would be of far less value to them than would the prayers of the saints whose wants they might relieve. Barnes truly says that “he who has secured the pleadings of a child of God, however humble, in his behalf, has made a good use of his money.” *SITI January 3, 1884, page 6.13*

“Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift.” This is an appropriate closing to this sermon on giving. The idea in the mind of the apostle was doubtless that expressed in the beginning; that a liberal spirit is due to the grace of God. But the grace of God is manifested in its fullness in giving his Son to die for man; and as Paul was speaking of gifts, his mind would naturally turn to the first and greatest of all of gifts. It is an “unspeakable gift;” no tongue can tell its value; even the angels are unable to comprehend it. And it is the only real gift that was ever made; for whereas our fellow mortals have a claim on our charity, men had no claim on God. “God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” *Romans 5:8*. “Herein is love, not that we love God, but that he loved us.” *1 John 4:10*. Compared with God’s gift to man, the most that we can do is nothing; and as the contemplation of a gift tends to reduce gratitude, we should stimulate our liberality by constant meditation on this unspeakable gift, and an earnest desire to have as clear a sense of its value as it is possible for the human mind to possess. E. J. W. *SITI January 3, 1884, page 7.1*

January 10, 1884

“The Sabbath-School. 2 Corinthians, Chaps. 11-13” The Signs of the Times, 10, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST-JAN. 19.

2 Corinthians, Chaps. 11-13

Brief Comments on 2 *Corinthians* 11.

“Would to God ye could bear with me a little in my folly; and indeed bear with me.” 2 *Corinthians* 11:1. The translators took unwarranted liberty in this case, as in some others, in inserting the word God when there is nothing in the original to indicate it. A literal translation would be, “Would that ye could bear with me;” or, “I wish that ye could bear with me.” This would properly represent the apostle, and not make it appear that he was in the habit of making a strong appeal to God on every slight location. This item should be emphasized, and carefully noted, in order that none may think that they have apostolic example for such appeals. Very many persons who would be shocked at any intimation that they are profane, are really guilty of violating the third commandment. That precept says, “Thou shall not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.” That is, The name of the Lord must never be spoken unless it is absolutely necessary. Repeating oaths that others have uttered; a light use of the sacred name of the Deity in ordinary conversation; very frequent repetition of this name even in prayer; and an appeal to God in any ordinary occasion,-these are all violations of the third commandment. We may be assured that Paul was never guilty of taking the name of the Lord in vain.*SITI January 10, 1884, page 21.1*

In this chapter and the following one, the apostle enters into a commendation of himself. He was forced to do this for the sake of the cause, and not for any personal consideration. The second and third verses give this reason for this boasting. It was his intense love for those who have accepted the truth under his labors, and his fear that they would be led astray, that moved him to do it. Someone was trying to overthrow the faith of the Corinthians, by

setting forth that Paul was an impostor. If the people should lose their confidence in Paul, all his preaching would go for nothing. But he knew that he had been sent by the Lord, and had preached the truth; and rather than have been seduced from their allegiance, he reluctantly vindicated his claim to be an inspired apostle. On *verse 2*, Dr. Barnes says: "The allusion here, according to Doddridge, is to the custom among the Greeks 'of having an officer whose business it was to educate and form young women, especially those of rank and figure, designed for marriage, and then to present them to those who were to be their husbands; and if this officer through negligence permitted them to be corrupted between the espousals and the consummation of the marriage, great blame would fall upon him.' Such a responsibility Paul felt." There never was a man who had more of which he might boast, than Paul had, and there are few who do less. His humility is apparent even in the midst of his enforced self-commendation, and shows that it was others, and not self, of whom he was thinking. *SITI January 10, 1884, page 21.2*

"For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received, or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him." *Verse 4*. Most commentators think that this means that if the one who was seeking to supplant Paul could offer to them a more powerful Saviour, and more exalted spiritual advantages than he had done, they would be excusable for following the new comer. But there is no pronoun expressed in the Greek, and the translators have placed the pronoun "me" in the margin. This, we are inclined to think, should be inserted in the text, so that the last clause would read, "ye might well bear with me." The next verse seems to make this necessary. Even if another Jesus, and another gospel were preached to them, Paul argues that they ought to still bear with him; "for," says he, "I suppose I was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles." This was a good reason why they should be slow to accept the teachings of another in preference to his. *SITI January 10, 1884, page 21.3*

"But though I be rude in speech, and yet not in knowledge." *Verse 6*. Paul's traducers had evidently sought to weaken his hold on the Corinthians, by sneering at his manner of speaking. Paul does not deny that his speech was rude, *i.e.*, unpolished, but he claims with

truth that his manner of speaking did not in the least affect the truth of what he preached. From his childhood Paul had doubtless been familiar with the Greek language, but it could not be expected that he would speak it with all the polish of a native Greek. Corinth occupied somewhat the same position that Paris does in modern times. Its inhabitants prided themselves on the elegance of their language, and could be easily led to ridicule one whose speech showed that he was not a native of the metropolis. "Critics profoundly acquainted with the Greek language remark that while there is great energy of thought and of diction in the writings of Paul; while he chooses or coins most expressive words, yet there is ever a want of Attic elegance of manner, and of the smoothness and beauty which were so grateful to a Grecian ear."-*Barnes*. This attempt to weaken Paul's influence by ridiculing his straightforward, terse language, shows clearly the contemptible spirit that actuated his opposers. Such men have their successors at the present day.*SITI January 10, 1884, page 21.4*

It is not opposers alone who criticize to their own and others' detriment. Many professors often lose the greater part of a valuable discourse, by letting their minds dwell upon some inaccuracies in the language of the speaker; for they will stop to note some statement that might be construed to mean exactly the opposite of what the speaker intended. And while they are thus engaged, they are oblivious to golden truths which are being uttered. Persons with such a critical turn of mind as that are to be pitied. They feed on husks, and miss the wholesome, nourishing grain. Instead of cultivating such a disposition, they should seek to get rid of it as quickly as possible, and learn to "desire the sincere milk of the word," that they may grow thereby.*SITI January 10, 1884, page 21.5*

"Have I committed an offense in abasing myself that ye might be exalted, because I have preached to you the gospel of God freely?" *Verse 7*. This verse contains a most delicate yet pointed reproof, and at the same time a vindication of Paul's own integrity. He had not accepted anything from the Corinthians, but had been supported by other churches, especially those of Macedonia, and had also contributed to his own support, by manual labor. It seems that the Corinthian church had been negligent of Paul's wants, and

had willingly allowed others to provide for him. But while rebuking the church for this neglect of a plain duty, he declares that he will still keep himself from being burdensome to any; not because he does not love them, but because he is determined that his captious critics shall have no occasion of accusing him of trying to enrich himself at the expense of his converts. *SITI January 10, 1884, page 21.6*

We cannot get the full force of Paul's language in *verses 7-9* without reading *verses 12 and 13* of the next chapter. Continuing the same subject, he says: "Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds. For what is it wherein ye were inferior to other churches, except it be that I myself was not burdensome to you? forgive me this wrong." From this, as well as from many other passages, we learn that it is a privilege as well as a duty for the churches to contribute to the support of the gospel. Indeed, an absolute necessity, for in this same epistle Paul says that "He which soweth sparingly shall reap all so sparingly." He here has reference to money, and it naturally follows that he who neglects to sow will surely fail to reap. Paul had not urged the Corinthians to the employment of this privilege in his case, and he humbly says, "forgive me this wrong." And now we can see how completely he turns the tables upon his accusers in *chapter 11:7*. He shows them that the only thing in which he can be said to be inferior to the other apostles is the fact that he supported himself; and while the members of the Corinthian church allowed him to do that which in reality exalted him above all others, they were proving themselves to be inferior to other churches. Most churches are very ready to forgive an offense of this kind on the part of their minister; but if the Corinthians were not more active in supporting the cause of God after this, they must have been obtuse and careless in the extreme. Let modern church-members take good heed to the apostle's delicate reproof, lest they show themselves to be inferior, and thus lose a great blessing. *SITI January 10, 1884, page 21.7*

In *verse 13* Paul declares that those who have been seeking occasions against him are "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ." And lest any should be inclined to doubt this statement, thinking it impossible

that impostors could so successfully personate true apostles, he adds: "And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness." *SITI January 10, 1884, page 21.8*

Some persons make a great ado when a professor, and especially a minister, is found to be a rascal, and would make the Christian religion responsible for the misdeeds of all who may profess to be its followers. The fact that the fall of a professed Christian, be he minister or layman, is so loudly heralded by unbelievers, is a compliment to the cause which they despise, for it proves that they expect better things of Christian professors. But why should it be thought a strange thing that bad men should be in the church, and even in the ministry? Do men express surprise when they find a wolf in the sheepfold? Do they not expect that the wolf will go, if he can, where he can inflict the most injury on the flock? Would they not be more surprised if he should willingly stay outside? Then why should they marvel that wicked men seek to accomplish their master's work by the same methods? Satan himself appears as an angel of light, and he is able to help his servants to play the hypocrite to perfection also. Every valuable coin is counterfeited, but the base coin does not make the truth any less valuable. *SITI January 10, 1884, page 21.9*

While the gospel ministry is the most exalted of any calling, and the true minister of Christ is worthy of esteem and affection, a man should not be received, nor all that he says believed, simply because he ranks as a minister. No one need be deceived, if he will only apply the proper test. John says: "Beloved, believed not every spirit [teacher], but try the spirits whether they are of God; for many false profits are gone out into the world." *1 John 4:1*. And the prophet Isaiah gives the rule by which we are to try them: "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." *Isaiah 8:20*. Although it is the office of preachers to handle the word of God, and explain it to the people, we are not to throw away reason, and accept everything that they may teach, simply because they speak with authority. We are to sanctify the Lord in our hearts, as much for the purpose of being able to discern between truth and error, as to be able to tell

the reason of our hope. *SITI January 10, 1884, page 21.10*

The minister may be far superior to his flock in intellectual endowments, if God is able to give spiritual discernment so that the humblest may be able to judge correctly as to the truth of what is preached. Many at the present time seek to excuse themselves for observing the first day instead of the seventh day, which God commanded, on the ground that many learned ministers of the gospel teach and practice first-day observance. This excuse is often made as a last resort, when the person is really convinced of the truth. Like the ostrich that hides its head in the sand and thinks itself secure from its pursuers, they seem to imagine that the error of their teachers, whether ignorant or willful, will shield them from the wrath of God. Such ones should remember that Paul's words are as true of lay members as of ministers, that their "end shall be according to their works." See also *Romans 14:10-12; Revelation 20:12; 22:12*. E. J. W. *SITI January 10, 1884, page 22.1*

January 31, 1884

“General Meeting at Healdsburg” The Signs of the Times, 10, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

This meeting, continuing from the 3rd to the 13th, was in many respects the best meeting ever held in this State. The attendance was even better than was anticipated, as meetings in California in the winter season are not usually very well attended. However, nearly all the churches in the central and northern part of the State were represented at this one. *SITI January 31, 1884, page 73.1*

Four interesting meetings of the Tract and Missionary Society were held; even this number did not afford an opportunity for transacting all the business that should have been considered. Any one who attends the sessions of our Conference and our Missionary Society year after year, in other States as well as in this, cannot fail to be impressed with the fact that this is a growing work. Every year we are increasing our facilities, and broadening our plans for work, and still we fall far short of the necessities of the case. The progress of the cause within the last year alone, should teach us that God is leading in this work, and that he is only waiting for us to manifest our faith in a practical matter, in order to grant us his blessing in still greater abundance. We must not limit the work of God, for his plans are far in advance of what our feeble faith has been able to grasp. *SITI January 31, 1884, page 73.2*

The resolutions that were passed recognized the fact that the territories adjoining the Pacific Coast States afford a large field for the carrying on of missionary work by correspondence. These territories are being rapidly settled by a good class of people, and there is as yet no reason for those of our people who cannot go into the harvest-field in person, to think that there is nothing for them to do. *SITI January 31, 1884, page 73.3*

Besides this, the representatives of the various churches made earnest calls for help, not alone in the churches, but in the adjoining country. A gratifying feature of these calls was that, with few exceptions, those making the call pledged themselves to care for

any minister who might be sent to their locality, and also to give their own time to visiting and canvassing. It is a source of regret that the scarcity of laborers makes it impossible for more than one in twenty of the calls for ministerial help to receive immediate attention. We are not sure, however, but that this is in the order of God, that our people may give themselves individually to the work. Each one must pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers, and must realize the obligation resting upon him to do his part toward answering his own prayer. The work must largely be done by corresponding, canvassing, and Bible-reading, and could all the brethren and sisters in the State have been present as the appeals for help came in, we are sure that the number taking the special course at the College would now be doubled.*SITI January 31, 1884, page 73.4*

A class for practical instruction in the art of canvassing was organized by Eld. W. C. White, which met as often as the frequency of other meetings will allow. Those who attended these exercises came much Bible information as to how to properly present the SIGNS, *Good Health*, etc. Canvassing is getting to be an important factor in the advancement of the Third Angel's Message, and the canvasser needs a special preparation for the work, as well as does the minister. Nothing that can be used to assist in spreading the light of the truth should be lightly esteemed.*SITI January 31, 1884, page 73.5*

There were but eight sermons delivered during the whole ten days' meeting, - one each by Elders Healey and Boyd, two by the Editor of the SIGNS, and four by Mrs. E. G. White. Although these sermons were listened to with great attention by many not of our faith, their object was not especially to unfold doctrine, but to give instruction in vital godliness, and stir up the minds of believers to an appreciation of the importance of the present hour. The fact that we are now living in the antitypical day of atonement, and that Christ, our high priest, will soon cease pleading for sinners, was emphasized, and made a deep impression, which we hope will be lasting. If we could keep this solemn thought constantly in our minds, what carefulness it would produce in our daily life, and what zeal in the Master's work! As in the typical day of atonement, we should afflict our souls, and humble our souls before God.*SITI January 31, 1884, page 73.6*

A noted feature of this meeting was the Bible-readings, of which there were thirteen. These were upon the following subjects: Second Advent, Sabbath, Spiritual Gifts, Tithing, and the Sanctuary. The deepest interest was manifested in these readings, and much good was done. Many who had not previously paid tithes, were fully convinced of their duty in this respect, and publicly resolved to pay to the Lord his dues. An aged gentleman from the East was detained in the place during the meetings, and attended regularly. At the close he said that although he was at first much prejudiced against the views of Seventh-day Adventists, the constant appeal "to the law and to the testimony," had completely disarmed him. The knowledge that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and expressed his intention to walk in the light. There can be no doubt that Bible-readings, judiciously conducted, are destined to become a powerful auxiliary in spreading the knowledge of the truth. When brought face to face with a plain "Thus saith the Lord" on every point, candid persons cannot do otherwise than yield assent. As the gentleman above-mentioned said, "An infidel might raise objections, but a believer in the Bible certainly cannot gainsay such testimony." *SITI January 31, 1884, page 73.7*

The prayer and social meetings were, from the first, seasons of special interests. Each morning, except Sabbath, a special meeting was held at six o'clock. The first two were simply for the ministers and missionary workers; after that all were invited. Another one was held each day at nine o'clock A.M. At all of the social meetings Sister White was present, contributing largely to the ultimate success of the meeting. Her plain and pointed testimony was well received, and the Spirit of the Lord moved many to make humble confession of past wrongs. Special labor was put forth for the spiritual advancement of the Healdsburg Church. Some difficulties of long standing were happily adjusted, the brethren and sisters resolving henceforth to love not "in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth." All felt that if this had been the only object gained, the meeting would have been a grand success. We hope that the earnest exhortation is to keep the mind fixed upon Christ, that the increase in knowledge of his love may produce corresponding love and humility in the heart, may be acted upon by all. *SITI January 31, 1884, page 74.1*

On the last Sabbath afternoon, after a sermon by Sister White on Love to God, fifty-five persons came forward, asking the prayers of God's people. The number included both backsliders and those making their first start in the Christian life, and of all ages, from the little child to the gray-haired man. These repaired to a side room in the building, where every one bore a good testimony. *SITI January 31, 1884, page 74.2*

The closing social meeting on Sunday morning was one of the best we ever attended. The spirit of thanksgiving to God prevailed, and the meeting was a veritable praise service. "Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me," says the Lord. As Christians we do not praise the Lord enough. The idea seems to prevail that we must overcome all sins before we have any right to praise God. But the truth is, that we cannot overcome the first without the help and blessing of God, and as soon as we feel the least of his blessing, it is our duty to praise him. By praising God for what we have, we keep our hearts warm, and in a condition to receive more of his blessing. Surely "It is a good thing to give thanks unto the Lord." *SITI January 31, 1884, page 74.3*

At the close of the service, several expressed a desire for baptism, and after the next service, the congregation repaired to the water, where eighteen souls were buried with Christ by baptism. Of this number, ten unite with the Healdsburg Church; of the latter number, seven are College students. The series of meetings closed with a sermon by the Editor of the SIGNS, on "The Rest that remains for the people of God." *SITI January 31, 1884, page 74.4*

Every part of the meeting was possible, and its influence on the cause in this State can never be fully known until the Judgment. We hope that many other churches in this Conference may have the privilege of a like experience. E. J. W. *SITI January 31, 1884, page 74.5*

February 28, 1884

“A Humiliating Confession” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

In a recent number of the *Christian Statesman*, a lecturer for the “National Reform” party, tells of the extreme wickedness of St. Louis, and of the difficulty which the pastors experience in getting even the members of their own churches to attend regular services. The condition of affairs is truly distressing, but as we read in the same article a portion of a conversation with one of the pastors of the city, we could not feel that the fault lay primarily with the lay members. *SITI February 28, 1884, page 137.1*

It seems that the Ministers’ Association of the city declined to accept an invitation from the Women’s Christian Temperance Union to preach on the subject of prohibition. As an excuse for their course, one of the ministers said:-*SITI February 28, 1884, page 137.2*

“Don’t be discouraged because we do not work with you in this reform. Our hearts are with you. It does not require a majority now to turn off a minister. One or two can do it, if they have money. It is unsafe for us to take a higher standard than the lowest in our congregations, for the people say we must be a unit, or the pastor must go. We are like men pulling a sled on slippery ice. We have to be careful or our feet will fly.” *SITI February 28, 1884, page 137.3*

How much self-respect can such a man have? How dare not preach that which will displease his hearers. It is safe to say that in every congregation there are some whose taste are exceedingly low and depraved—who attend church and wear the cloak of religion in order to conceal some of their evil deeds; and yet the pastors say, “It is unsafe for us to take a higher standard than the lowest in our congregations.” Is it any wonder that the people are not elevated? When ministers of the gospel deliberately pawn their honor for their salary, is it surprising that the people sell their souls for lust and lucre? *SITI February 28, 1884, page 137.4*

Perhaps some of our friends would accuse us of lack of charity if we should say that the course which those pastors pursue is in exact fulfillment of *Isaiah 56:10, 11*, but we ask them to read the text, and see if it is not at least a parallel; and then we ask them to decide whether or not it is safe to unhesitatingly accept the first day of the week as the Sabbath, simply because the popular ministers say that it is. Is it not time for the people to search the Scriptures for themselves, to ascertain if these things are so? If such a course was commendable in Paul's day, and under *his* preaching, is it not imperatively necessary now? E. J. W. *SITI February 28, 1884, page 137.5*

March 13, 1884

“Progress of the Work at Healdsburg” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

The first Sabbath in this month was a day of interest and profit to the church at Healdsburg; of profit not only to the church, but to the College, and through it to the cause throughout the State. In the forenoon, Eld. Corliss preached from *Colossians 3:2, 3*: “Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God.” The responsibilities resting upon those who profess to be members of Christ’s body, were clearly set forth. We belong to the family of Christ, and are individually responsible for the reputation of the family. The danger of becoming estranged from Christ by following the vain and silly fashions of the world, was dwelt upon with earnestness. The true Christian will indeed be dead, insensible to the allurements of the world. *SITI March 13, 1884, page 169.1*

After the sermon, the congregation repaired to the usual place of baptism, where six souls were baptized, as evidence of their faith in the death and resurrection of Christ, and their determination to be henceforth new creatures in Christ. Four of this number were students at the College, two of them from Mendocino County, one from Humboldt County, and one a resident of Healdsburg. *SITI March 13, 1884, page 169.2*

In the afternoon some twenty of those who intend to labor in the various capacities in the field during the summer, met in one of the rooms of the College building, together with Elds. White, Corliss, Israel, and Healey, to consider some plans for the coming campaign. So far as a division of labor had been made, all heartily acquiesced in the suggestions of the Conference Committee, expressing themselves as willing to labor to the extent of their ability, in any field to which they might be assigned. As testimonies and exhortations were given, the Spirit of the Lord came into the meeting, and all felt strengthened and encouraged. *SITI March 13, 1884, page 169.3*

We believe that the spirit of love and harmony that exists among the workers, and which seems to be increasing, augurs well for the success of the work. As was stated by one brother, the laborers must press together if they would see the work prosper. But it is God who sends prosperity, and blesses our efforts; in order to succeed, we must draw near to God, and when we all get near him, it follows as a natural consequence that we will be near to one another. We confidently expect to see the cause of God advanced greatly this year. If God is in the work of which there can be no doubt, and the workers go forth accompanied by his Spirit, we certainly may expect great things. *SITI March 13, 1884, page 169.4*

During the past two weeks the missionary class has enjoyed the presence and labors of Bro. White, who has given much Bible instruction in regard to canvassing, doing colporteur work, and preparing a field for tent labor. Certainly those who go into the field with a definite plan of operations in mind, and are fortified, as far as possible, against every objection that can be made, have a far better prospect of success than those who go out trusting alone to their general, unclassified knowledge, and the inspiration of the moment, for the means to awaken the interest of the indifferent, and to answer those who make objections. It is just this definite, practical knowledge that the instructors at Healdsburg College came to impart. Brethren, remember the work, and pray for the workers. E. J. W. *SITI March 13, 1884, page 169.5*

March 20, 1884

“The Support of the Poor” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

There are many Christians who use their tithe as a sort of charity fund, from which they make all their gifts and offerings, of whatever kind. But the Bible recognizes no such plan as this. The poor are to be supported, but not with the Lord's tithe. In ancient times the following was one provision made for the poor: “And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not wholly reap the corners of thy field, neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest. And thou shalt not glean thy vineyard, neither shalt thou gather every grape of thy vineyard; thou shalt leave them for the poor and stranger: I am the Lord your God.” *Leviticus 19:9, 10*. See also *23:22; Deuteronomy 24:19-21*. *SITI March 20, 1884, page 185.1*

Some may argue from *Deuteronomy 26:12, 13* that the tithe was to be used for the support of the poor, but in this text we see not only the careful provision made for the poor, but the sacredness with which the Lord's tithe was devoted to the one object for which it was designed. We quote the text: “When thou hast made an end of tithing all the tithes of thine increase the third year, which is the year of tithing, and hast given it unto the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, that they may eat within thy gates, and be filled; then thou shalt say before the Lord thy God, I have brought away the hallowed things out of mine house, and also have given them unto the Levite, and unto the stranger, to the fatherless, and to the widow, according to all thy commandments which thou hast commanded me; I have not transgressed thy commandments, neither have I forgotten them.” The command here referred to is found in *Deuteronomy 14:22-29*, where, in addition to the requirement to give to the stranger, the fatherless, etc., this statement is made: “And thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God, in the place which he shall choose to place his name there, the tithe of thy corn, of thy wine, and of thine oil, and the firstlings of thy herds and of thy flocks.” *SITI March 20, 1884, page 185.2*

Now when we read in *Numbers 18:21*, “Behold, I have given the

children of Levi *all the tenth in Israel* for an inheritance, for their service which they serve, even the service which they serve, even the service of the tabernacle of the congregation,” we are forced to the conclusion that the tithe spoken of in *Deuteronomy 14* and *20* is not the same as that which was devoted to the Levites on account of their service in the sanctuary, for the stranger could not by any possibility be counted as one of the Levites. We can harmonize the two Scriptures only on the ground that the tithe which the people themselves, together with “the Levites, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow,” were to eat, was a *second tithe*, taken after the tithe for the Levites had been given them. This view of the question is taken by all commentators of whom we have any knowledge. And there are some who claim that every third year a third tithe was collected. We quote a few testimonies:-*SITI March 20, 1884, page 185.3*

“Another important privilege enjoyed by the poor was, what was called *second* tithes and second firstlings. Besides the tenth received by the Levites, the Israelites were obliged to set apart *another* tenth of their garden field produce; and in like manner of their cattle, a second set of offerings, for the purpose of presenting as thank offerings at the high festivals. Of these thank offerings only certain fat pieces were consumed on the altar; the remainder, after deducting the priests’ portion, was appropriated to the sacrifice feasts, to which the Israelites were bound to invite a stranger, the widow, and the orphan.” *Horne’s Introduction, Vol. 2, Part II, chap. viii.**SITI March 20, 1884, page 185.4*

“Besides the first-fruits, the Jews also paid tithes or tenths of all they possessed. *Numbers 18:21*. They were in general collected of all the produce of the earth (*Leviticus 27:30; Deuteronomy 14:22, 23; Nehemiah 13:5, 10*), but chiefly of corn, wine, and oil, and were rendered every year except the sabbatical year. When these tithes were paid, the owner of the fruits further gave another tenth part, which was carried up to Jerusalem, and eaten in the temple at offering feasts, as a sign of rejoicing and *gratitude to God*. These are called *second tithes*.”-*Ib., Vol. 2, Part III, chap. iii.**SITI March 20, 1884, page 185.5*

“Every year a tithe was paid to the Levites; and besides that a

second tithe, which was carried to Jerusalem and eaten there; and every third year it was eaten at home, in their towns and cities in the country instead of it, with the Levite, poor, and stranger, and was called the poor's tithe."-*Dr. John Gill, on Deuteronomy 26:12*. He gives other testimony to the same effect, in his comments on the succeeding verses, and on *Deuteronomy 14:23-28*, and *Leviticus 27:30*. *SITI March 20, 1884, page 185.6*

"Let there be taken out of your fruits a tenth besides what you have allotted to give to the priests and Levites. This you may indeed sell in the country, but it is to be used in those feasts and sacrifices that are to be celebrated in the holy city." *SITI March 20, 1884, page 185.7*

"Besides those two tithes which I have already said you are to pay every year, the one for the Levites, the other for the festivals, you are to bring every third year eight times to be distributed to those that want; two women also that our widows, and two children and orphans."-*Josephus' Ant., Book IV., chap. 8*. *SITI March 20, 1884, page 185.8*

These testimonies, and others that might be given, together with the argument previously adduced, show conclusively that the Lord's tithe was not used for the poor; and since it was not used either for building or repairing houses of worship, it must have been solely for those who labored in connection with sacred things. Indeed, how could it be otherwise. We read, "The tithe is *the Lord's*." It was to be deposited in the Lord's treasury. Now if I owe a friend ten dollars, it will not do for me to give any part of it to a poor man, even though I know that my friend would use the money in the same way, if I were to pay it to him. It belongs to no one but to my friend, and it would be highly dishonest for me to get a reputation for liberality, by giving away that to which I have no right. No one can be charitable on another's money. E. J. W. *SITI March 20, 1884, page 185.9*

March 27, 1884

“Systematic Giving” The Signs of the Times, 10, 13.

E. J. Waggoner

It will be readily seen that so far as tithes are concerned, the Bible plan of supporting the cause is very systematic. Each one gives in the same proportion. There is no fixed time at which persons should set apart their tithe, because it is to be the *first-fruits* of whatever they may receive, at whatever time it may come in. Whenever a man receives any part of his income, his first duty should be to take out the Lord's tithe, putting it in a place by itself. If he should at once credit his cash account with the amount of tithe set aside, he would be doing more nearly right still, for since the tithe does not belong to him, his books show just what money he really has on hand. There would then be less temptation to use the tithe while it remains in his hands, for the fact that it is not his own would appear more real. As to when the tithe should be paid into the treasury, will often depend on circumstances; many churches, however, have an arrangement for the treasurer to visit each member once a month, to collect whatever tithes they may have on hand. This plan has many advantages, but it does not hinder anybody from handing in his tithe during the interval, if he so desires. *SITI March 27, 1884, page 201.1*

The fact can be well-established, I think, that the Bible plan is that men should also be systematic in their offerings. Why should we not think so? “God is not the author of confusion,” and there is order and system in his works. But we need not depend on our unassisted reason for the establishment of systematic offerings. A familiar Bible text settles the matter beyond controversy. We quote:-*SITI March 27, 1884, page 201.2*

“Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come. And when I come, whomsoever ye shall approve by your letters, them will I send to bring your liberality unto Jerusalem.” *1 Corinthians 16:1-*

3. *SITI March 27, 1884, page 201.3*

It is evident from even a casual reading of this text that the apostle has reference to offerings, and not to the tithes. For (1) that which the churches were to lay aside is called “liberality,” a term that, as we have seen, cannot be applied to the tithe. (2) Paul said that this especial contribution was “for the poor saints which are in Jerusalem.” *Romans 15:26*; but the tithe, we remember, was not used for the support of the poor. And (3) the tithe is the *first-fruits* of the increase, and could not therefore always be paid on any day of the week; for while some might every day be receiving that which they could tithe, others might not receive anything as often as once a month. *SITI March 27, 1884, page 201.4*

The question will arise, Was this order designed to be followed by all Christians, or was it merely a local and temporary arrangement? We answer, that while the necessity for this special collection would soon cease to exist, the plan is one that should be pursued by all. The fact that the apostle made the arrangement, not for one church merely, but for many, and that it was of sufficient importance to be preserved in the inspired writings for all generations, is sufficient evidence of this. “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable.” We can see nothing more toward profit in this text, than that our offerings to the poor and to various worthy the objects, should be according to a definite plan. *SITI March 27, 1884, page 201.5*

When God gave laws through Moses for the government of his people, he gave direction concerning the poor as follows: “If there be among you a poor man of one of thy brethren within any of thy gates in thy land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not harden thine heart, nor shut thine hand from thy poor brother; but thou shalt open thine hand wide unto him, and shalt surely lend him sufficient for his need, in that which he wanteth.” *Deuteronomy 15:7, 8*. The word “lend” is used here, but the verses following plainly shows that they were to expect no return; and he immediately after follows the statement, “For the poor shall never cease out of the land.” *SITI March 27, 1884, page 201.6*

The New Testament bounds in exhortations by Christ and the

apostles, to care for the poor, and the quotation last made was reaffirmed by Christ shortly before his crucifixion, when he said, "For ye have the poor always with you." *Matthew 26:11.SITI March 27, 1884, page 201.7*

Now, query: If it is our duty to care for the poor, and they are to be ever-present with us, would it not be negligence on our part, if we did not make constant provision for them? Is it not because people let their offerings depends so much upon impulse, that there is so much suffering among the poor? Much needless suffering would be avoided if all made systematic offerings as a matter of principle. The heart is often touched by scenes of woe, or by appeals for aid, but, because no previous preparation has been made, we have nothing to give, and our sympathy is useless. To say to a brother or sister, "Be ye warmed and filled," or to wish it, and not give them those things which are needful to the body, profits no more at the present time than it did in the days of the apostles.*SITI March 27, 1884, page 201.8*

The text under consideration (*1 Corinthians 16:1, 2*) plainly teaches that our offerings, for the poor at least, are to be made from a fund which is the result of sums of money regularly set apart for that purpose. These weekly deposits are to be made after a calculation of our income, of which they are to be a definite proportion. What that proportion should be, each one must determine for himself. The amount once laid aside, it should be considered as sacred as the tithe. Although it is in our own power to say how much we will give, whether more or less, when the amount to be given is decided in our minds, we have placed the matter out of our own hands. Having once vowed, even though the vow were not uttered a record of it is made in Heaven, and God will surely require it of us. "When thou shalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou shalt not slack to pay it; for the Lord thy God will surely require of thee; and it would be sin in thee." *Deuteronomy 23:21*. As was recommended in the case of the tithe, a good way to do is to not only set the sum apart in a place by itself; but place it to the credit of our cash account; then there will be less danger of temptation to use it for ourselves.*SITI March 27, 1884, page 202.1*

But some one will say, "I don't believe God wants us to give

because we feel obliged to; I believe he would better have us give cheerfully; and there is something repulsive in such a methodical way of making offerings." Well, excepting the last statement, we believe just so too. But is it so that God is more pleased with service that is performed fitfully, yea, almost by accident, than with that service which is the result of a settled purpose? Does he take greater delight in one who gives to his cause or to the poor on a certain occasion, because it happens to be convenient, than in one who *makes* it convenient to give whenever there is need? Most assuredly not. Joshua said, "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord;" and his pious determination stands as a continual rebuke to those who neglect to choose once for all the course they will pursue. *SITI March 27, 1884, page 202.2*

Let us hear the words of the apostles: "Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity; for God love with a cheerful giver." *2 Corinthians 9:7*. Our giving is to be the result of a *cheerful determination*. God loves a cheerful giver yet he is pleased that we should have a previous "purpose" in our hearts. It is with giving as with any other service, it should be done from principle, yet willingly. Take, for instance, the Sabbath. There is a specific command for its observance, and all our plans in all time, are to be made with reference to it. The commandment is unconditional and unyielding; and yet God requires us to "call the Sabbath a delight." The fact is, if the duty is irksome, our only way is to do it faithfully, and *make* ourselves like it. And if we go about in the duty from principle, resolved to like it because it *is* our duty, God will give us grace to find in it our highest pleasure. The carnal mind is enmity against God, and not subject to his law but it is possible for us to be so changed as to love him, and to delight in his law. *SITI March 27, 1884, page 202.3*

One more thought in regard to systematic giving. Paul desired that the Corinthians should "abound in this grace also." *2 Corinthians 8:7*. The ability to give, then, is one of the graces, and like all others is bestowed by God. *Verses 1, 2*. But graces grow only by constant exercise; therefore there should be constant giving, else we shall be lacking in one of the graces, and thus fail of eternal life. The great object to giving is after all more for our own benefit than for the benefit of others. God could miraculously supply the wants of his

cause and of the poor, but we would be the losers. We must be like Christ if we would inherit the kingdom of God; and of him we are told that “though he was rich,” yet for our sake “he became poor.” Perfect unselfishness characterized his whole life. Unlike him, selfishness is that which prompts every act of our natural heart, the only way to overcome is by a determined performance of those things which selfishness would lead us to avoid. As Napoleon said, “Find out what the enemy wants, and then do exactly the opposite.” This plan, persistently followed, will drive the enemy from the field, and give us a glorious victory. *SITI March 27, 1884, page 202.4*

The greatest favor God can bestow upon us in this life is to allow us to have a part in giving to his cause, and to the poor. If God should transform us into the divine image, by an act of his mighty power, we would not be the gainers thereby, for we would be liable to fall with the first temptation that presented itself; and if, having transformed us, he should keep us in that condition by the same power, we would be mere machines. God designs that we shall work out our own salvation, in order that we may have a moral character of our own; he will give us assistance, without which we can do nothing, yet we must do the work ourselves. *SITI March 27, 1884, page 202.5*

What has been said concerning systematic offerings is not designed to cut off special offerings. Thank offerings and sin offerings are as necessary now as in the days of Moses, and every Christian will feel called upon at times to make them. This we should do whenever the necessity arises, but should not even then neglect to “lay in store” our regular contribution. We would again emphasize the fact that the benefit to be derived from offerings is gained only by continuous giving. If our whole contribution would amount to about five dollars, it would be far better to pay ten cents every week than to pay the entire sum at the end of the year. It would be as wise to think of doing all our praying on the first or last day of the year, has to do all our giving for the year at one time, and then think know more about it. *SITI March 27, 1884, page 202.6*

April 3, 1884

“Systematic Giving. (Concluded.)” The Signs of the Times, 10, 14.

E. J. Waggoner

(Concluded.)

There is a common objection to the tithing plan, that demands a brief notice. The matter of tithing is not spoken of directly by any of the apostles, nor are any of the churches enjoined by them to pay tithe. But the man who thinks to escape the payment of tithes by such a plea as this has overreached himself; for (1) Christ taught it, as has been shown in the comment on *Matthew 23:23*. That alone would be sufficient. (2) The commandment to pay tithe having been once made by God himself, it would remain in force, forever, if not countermanded, and the reason for its continuance existed as in the beginning. Therefore if there was no mention made of it in the entire New Testament, it would not affect the case in the least. And, strongest of all, we find (3) that the teaching of the apostles, and of Christ himself, if strictly followed, would lead to the sacrifice, not merely of a tithe, but of *all* our possessions! Let us read and see. *SITI April 3, 1884, page 217.1*

Paul, writing to the Corinthians, says, “Ye are not your own; for ye are bought with a price.” We are, as a literal translation of *Philippians 1:1* would read, “the slaves of Jesus Christ.” Our servitude, however, is a blessed one, for his yoke is easy, and his burden light. But a slave cannot hold property in his own right; all that he may acquire belongs to his master. Therefore since we are Christ’s by purchase, all that we have belongs to him. Then if we give him his just due, we will give, not one-tenth, but *all* that we have. *SITI April 3, 1884, page 217.2*

With this conclusion agree the words of Christ: “Sell that ye have, and give alms; provide yourselves bags which lacks not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth.” *Luke 12:33*. When the young man came to him inquiring the way to life eternal, “Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and

thou shalt have treasure in Heaven; and come and follow me.”
Matthew 19:21.SITI April 3, 1884, page 217.3

We do not wish to be understood as advising all indiscriminately to sell their property. We are to be guided by sanctified reason, and not by fanaticism. “To everything there is a season,” and if we stand at the counsel of God, we shall know when the time comes for us to part with our possessions. We need not hold it all, however, so that it may be sold at once. If we study the lives of the reformers, and the most devoted Christians, we will find that they gave away nearly all they had, in their life-time, and died poor. Had they been intent on laying up treasure on this earth, they would not have given themselves so unreservedly to the work of preparing themselves and others for a better world; their interest would have been divided.*SITI April 3, 1884, page 217.4*

At the beginning of the Christian era was a time for men to sell all that they had. The cause of Christ had to struggle against fearful odds, to establish itself in the earth. There were but few Christians who had wealth, and those who had, “sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need.” *Acts 2:45*. They had given themselves wholly to Christ, and therefore none of them said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own. *Acts 4:32*. Since then there has not been so great need, and even true Christians have not felt it their duty to sell out everything, although they held all subject to the disposal of the Lord; the Master did not call for it. “But the end of all things is at hand,” and before the end shall come there will be a conflict between truth and error, such as the world has never witnessed. Even now the enemy is coming in like a flood, and the Spirit of the Lord is lifting up a standard against him. Satan is mustering all his forces for a last, desperate struggle; he is determined to deceive the whole world. But the message of the third angel, warning man against the worship of the beast and his image (*Revelation 14:9-15*), and preparing them for the coming of the Saviour, must go with a loud cry. Means are needed more and more every day, to carry forward the great work; and as the conflict increases, and approaches its consummation, the loyal soldiers of Jesus, realizing that earthly wealth will soon lose all its value, will know that the time has come to sell, and will throw out not only themselves, but all that

they have, into the cause of truth. *SITI April 3, 1884, page 217.5*

How soon this time will come, we know not, but it is fast approaching. In ancient times the value of acquired property varied according to the nearness of the year of jubilee. At the year of jubilee all land that had been sold returned to its original possessor. *Leviticus 25:8-16*. If that year were very far off, so that a man might reasonably expect to spend a life-time on land that he should buy, he would have to pay nearly or quite its full value; but if the year of jubilee were near at hand, the land would bring but a small sum, since the buyer would have possession for only a short time. Well, the year of jubilee is just at hand. The redemption of God's people draws nigh, and he will soon "proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof." The earth will then be given to him whose right it is (*Ezekiel 21:27*). Those, therefore, who are now putting their money into houses and lands, are being deceived. They are paying full price for that which is depreciating in value every day, and which will be worth nothing to them when the jubilee is proclaimed. In that day those who have still clung to their possessions, will cast their idols of silver and gold to the moles and to the bats, as worthless trash. May God grant, reader, that both you and I, ere that day dawn, shall have laid off all our treasure in Heaven, so that we may hail are expected Lord with joy, and receive an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not a way. E. J. W. *SITI April 3, 1884, page 217.6*

May 1, 1884

“Reasons for Not Observing Saturday” The Signs of the Times, 10, 17.

E. J. Waggoner

A member of one of our missionary societies has been in correspondence with his friends in the East concerning the Sabbath question. In reply to one of his letters, he received a long letter from his former pastor, a Disciple minister, in which the latter tried to reclaim the wandering member of his flock, by showing the absurdities of Sabbath observance. From this letter we were allowed to make a few extracts, embodying the principal part of the argument, which we herewith give for the benefit of all inquirers after truth. The letter indicated a sincere desire on the part of the writer to win the brother from supposed error, and we are therefore warranted in supposing that the best argument was given that could be found. We quote:-*SITI May 1, 1884, page 265.1*

“‘The Sabbath,’ it is not claimed is a term ever applied in the New Testament, or for many years after [the time when it was written], to the first day of the week. Hence is not claimed by me or my brethren that ‘the Sabbath’ of the Sinaitic law was changed. Talking about changing the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day is very much like the talk about changing circumcision to baptism.”*SITI May 1, 1884, page 265.2*

This is not a bad statement to start with. Now knowing that the first day of the week is nowhere in the New Testament called “the Sabbath,” that term being applied exclusively to the seventh day of the week, we call to mind these words of Christ: “But pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day.” *Matthew 24:20*. Christ was speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem, which occurred about forty years later. And what was to be the prayer of the disciples during these years? That they might not be obliged to violate the sanctity of the seventh-day Sabbath, and even to secure their own lives. If now the New Testament writers uniformly call the seventh day the Sabbath, “according to the commandment,” where shall we look for authority for first-day observance? Is not the one teaching such observance going

contrary to the New Testament? and will he not thus, under the anathema of Paul in *Galatians 1:8*? Indeed it is absurd to talk of changing the Sabbath of the Lord's appointments; but the papacy has *thought* himself able to do so (*Daniel 7:25*), and millions cheerfully acknowledge his claim. Again:-*SITI May 1, 1884, page 265.3*

"Statute law may and does change, but principles never. The basis of *all the law and the prophets* is given by our Lord as *love to God and man..... Man has no authority to change either*, but with the change of dispensation, God has given different commands as expressive of submission to him."*SITI May 1, 1884, page 265.4*

We ask, What is that which contains the record of the change of dispensation? The answer will be, "The New Testament." But our brother has admitted, as just quoted, that there was no change in "the Sabbath of the Mosaic law," and that, in the New Testament, the term Sabbath" is not applied to any other day than the seventh. Statute law *may* change, but we are not absolved from allegiance to it until that change takes place. But the New Testament contains no record of a change; on the contrary, Christ said "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." *Luke 16:17*. Now since "this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments," how can we have love to him if we violate one of them? No one can violate any portion of the law, and not violate the principle upon which is based.*SITI May 1, 1884, page 265.5*

Again we quote:-*SITI May 1, 1884, page 265.6*

"It is very easy to see that there is moral obligation to love, adore, and obey the Lord; and it is easy to understand that man's physical, intellectual, and moral good calls for a cessation from worldly occupations for a time, that the mind may be given to contemplation and worship; but that the observance of the seventh day of the week is of necessary moral obligation is a different matter. It was made obligatory by *appointment*. There was, no doubt, good reasons for such command, two at least of which are given in Scripture. 1. The creation. 2. The deliverance from Egypt."*SITI May 1, 1884, page 265.7*

The above seems to us to be an exceedingly cool piece of criticism

upon the Creator. Our friend is willing to allow that the Lord had reason for appointing the seventh day as the Sabbath, but does not think we are morally bound to keep it. Let us see. To start with, there are two points upon which we are agreed. 1. That the seventh-day Sabbath is of divine appointment. 2. That the New Testament always recognizes the seventh day, and no other, as the Sabbath. But our friend says that the Sabbath commandment is not of *moral* obligation. How does he know that? By what standard are we to judge of moral obligation? Is the human mind capable of deciding? Hardly. How does he know that to commit adultery is an immoral act? Not from his own consciousness, for thousands of men, as highly gifted by nature as he, have believed such an act to be consistent with the highest virtue, and even necessary in order to attain the highest good. Indeed it was openly advocated in practice by many of the ancient philosophers. The young were taught to lie if it seemed to be their advantage to do so. The sentiments may be found in the writings of classical authors: "When telling a lie will be profitable, let it be told." "There is nothing decorous in truth, but when it is profitable." These are the teachings of those who were esteemed virtuous, and who had no idea but that they were doing all that was required of them. *SITI May 1, 1884, page 265.8*

Now how does our brother happen to be so much wiser than those philosophers, and that he knows such things to be sinful? Because the Lord has said, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and, "Thou shalt not bear false witness." It is in just the same way that we know that it is a sin to violate the Sabbath. It is based on the unalterable facts of creation; and the commandment is placed with the other moral precepts. It may be said that moral principles are eternal, but that there was a time when even the reason for the Sabbath commandment did not exist. Very well; and there was also a time when no reason for the seventh commandment existed. Before man was created there was no necessity for such a commandment, and yet no one questions the fact that it is of moral obligation. But let it be remembered that the earth was created before man was, and that therefore the reason for the fourth commandment antedates that for the seventh. *SITI May 1, 1884, page 265.9*

It is difficult to fitly characterize the idea that the seventh-day

Sabbath is not of necessary moral obligation because “it was made obligatory by *appointment*.” That is, we are under no moral obligation to keep it, because the only authority for its observance is the word of God! But let us imagine a man with this idea brought before the bar of God at the last day. The Judge, who is also the law-maker, asks, “Why did you not keep the Sabbath? Did you not know that I had commanded its observance?” The reply comes, “Yes, Lord, I knew that, and publicly taught it, but I could find no reason for keeping the Sabbath, except the fact that you had made a commandment for its observance. I had no doubt but that you had a good reason for giving such a commandment; but since it rested solely on your authority, I did not feel under any obligation to keep it.” Certainly the best that could be done would be to punish the man for contempt. We have no desire to be harsh; and we do not believe that our brother feels any contempt for God’s authority; yet the above is just what his position amounts to. It is equivalent to saying that God is not the First Cause, but that there is a something called “moral principle” that is superior to him. *SITI May 1, 1884, page 265.10*

There is indeed “no doubt” but that God had “good reason” for setting apart the seventh day, as a reading of the fourth commandment will show. Here it is: “Six days shalt thou labor and all thy works; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in yet thou shalt not do any work.... for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore [for which reason] the Lord bless the Sabbath day and hallowed it.” *Exodus 20:9-11*. This is the reason which the Lord gives for appointing the seventh day as the Sabbath. And we ask, Does not the same reason still exist? Is it not still a fact that the Lord created heaven and earth in six days? Is it not as true now as it ever was that he rested upon, blessed, and sanctified [set apart] the seventh day? Certainly. Then if the *reason* for the observance of the seventh day still exists, is it not claimed that the Lord would be *unreasonable*, that is, acting contrary to reason, if he did not still require that it should be kept? Who will dare charge the Lord with folly? *SITI May 1, 1884, page 265.11*

As to the deliverance from Egypt we will simply state that Moses cites that to remind the Israelites of their special obligation to God.

Simple gratitude demanded that they should obey the commandment of God. But the reason for the institution of the Sabbath is given in the fourth commandment, which was spoken many years before. To us this reason seems so cogent that we dare not enter into controversy with the Lord on the subject.*SITI May 1, 1884, page 265.12*

Again, our friend says: "The apostles never commanded the observance of the Sabbath." We agree, and going step farther and say that it would have made no difference if they had. The apostles were not law-givers; they had no authority to issue commands. "There is one Law-giver, who is able to save and to destroy." *James 4:12*. And this Law-giver had issued a command for the observance of the Sabbath, thousands of years before the apostles were born, thus making it unnecessary for them to do so, even if they had been inclined to take matters into their own hands. The apostle Paul, speaking in behalf of his brethren in the ministry, said: "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though Christ did beseech you by us; for we pray you in Christ's stead, be reconciled to God." *2 Corinthians 5:20*. As Christ's ambassadors they followed his injunction to teach only what he had commanded them. *Matthew 28:20*. They, as well as we, owed allegiance to a sovereign power. It was left for the pope of Rome to usurp authority, and to issue laws of his own.*SITI May 1, 1884, page 266.1*

The above quotations are the chief reasons given in the letter for not observing the seventh day. It is but fitting that we should hear what the writer has to say for Sunday, which he terms the "Lord's day." Unfortunately his time expired before he could give his authority for that. What he says for it is contained in the following paragraph:-*SITI May 1, 1884, page 266.2*

"Our reasons for observing the Lord's day I have not time to give. I suggest, however, that the New Testament is not so much a book of precepts as of general principles. Even in those ordinances that are usually considered positive in their character, there is but little of the legislation or ritualistic."*SITI May 1, 1884, page 266.3*

It is enough. Why should he desire to say more? The New Testament is not a book of precepts, and therefore he keeps

Sunday. Briefly summed up, his position is this: We need not keep the seventh day, because it is simply commanded by the Lord; and we ought to keep the first day, because there is no command for it whatever! Further comment is unnecessary. Reader, are you willing to rest your case upon so sandy a foundation as that? "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter. Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man. For God shall bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." *Ecclesiastes 12:13, 14.* E. J. W.*SITI*
May 1, 1884, page 266.4

May 8, 1884

“General Meeting in Oakland” The Signs of the Times, 10, 1. The Signs of the Times, 10, 18.

E. J. Waggoner

We can say of this meeting, as of others that have been held in this State within the past two years, that it was one of the best we ever attended. Indeed, each successive meeting of this kind that we attend seems to us to be the very best. At this meeting there was quite a large attendance from abroad, San Francisco being well represented. On the last Sabbath of the meeting there were seventy-eight present from the church in that city. *SITI May 8, 1884, page 280.1*

The entire membership of the Oakland Sabbath-school is 220, but there were more than 300 present the first Sabbath, and 360 pupils were in their places at the opening of the school on the second Sabbath. Notwithstanding this large increase, there was not the slightest confusion, which speaks well, not only of the discipline of the Oakland school, but of the other schools that were represented. The Sabbath congregations numbered between 400 and 400, filling our church building to its utmost capacity. God has blessed the labors of the missionary workers in Oakland, so that our regular congregations are larger than ever before, and additions are constantly being made to our membership. *SITI May 8, 1884, page 280.2*

The interest of the meeting deepened from the beginning to the close. As usual, Bible-readings occupied a prominent place. There were eleven of these, covering the following subjects: Thanksgiving, Conversion, Duties of Church Members, Missionary work, Second Advent, Resurrection, Immortality, Sanctification, and Work of the Spirit. By these readings our people get a definite knowledge of the Bible, such as could be obtained in no other way. They cannot take the place of preaching, but, if rightly conducted, they can do work that preaching cannot. We regard it as a bad indication when a professed Seventh-day Adventist is not interested in Bible-reading. We must learn more of the Bible itself. *SITI May 8, 1884, page 280.3*

There were eight sermons preached during the meeting. The principal burden of these was for a deeper and more intelligent consecration to God. The difference between true and false sanctification was clearly shown. This was very timely, for the so-called “holiness” movement, which teaches instantaneous sanctification, without any change of habit on the part of the individual, is rapidly gaining ground, and Oakland is the headquarters of the delusion on this coast. In the discourses, and in the Bible-reading on Sanctification, it was shown that while we are justified freely by the grace of God as soon as we implicitly believe on Christ, the work of sanctification is a life work, a constant gaining of victories over sin, by the aid of the Spirit, and with the light from God’s word. This modern “holiness” movement is a deception of Satan, to cause men to be satisfied with themselves while trampling on God’s law. Thorough instruction concerning the law of God, and a close adherence thereto, is a sure safeguard against this delusion, and is at the same time the means by which we are to be truly sanctified. *John 17:17. SITI May 8, 1884, page 280.4*

The early morning prayer-meetings, which were attended by Sister White, were seasons of refreshing. If the instruction given by the servant of God shall be remembered and put into practice, there will certainly be a marked growth in grace among those who heard. True Christian experience, and the nature of faith were set forth with a clearness not to be misunderstood. While we are sanctified through the truth, that is, by obeying it, we can do nothing to atone for past sins. Christ knew the work that he had to do, and understood the frailty and sinfulness of human nature, before he undertook our salvation. God does not repulse us because we are sinful, but for this very reason invites us to come to him, through Christ, for pardon. One of the greatest blessings that he can bestow on us is to show us our sins; and when we see them, instead of giving way to discouragement, we must believe that he does pardon, according to his promise. *Isaiah 1:18, 19; 55:6, 7.* Faith in God is so simple that many overlook it. We are to believe, not because of any change in our own feelings, but because of God’s promise. We are not to look at ourselves, but “unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith.” *SITI May 8, 1884, page 280.5*

The meetings of the Tract and Missionary Society, as it will be seen

by the report, were full of encouragement to the workers. The meeting of the stockholders of the Publishing Association was especially interesting. The work has never been so prosperous as during the past year. There has been an increasing demand for our denominational literature, so that all the departments are crowded. It was the general feeling of the stockholders that more room is imperatively needed. We must provide, but simply for growth in the same proportion as in the past, but for a great increase. The work increases in geometrical ratio. The Lord has a great work for us to do in warning the world, and we must hold ourselves ready to follow at once wherever his providence opens the way. *SITI May 8, 1884, page 280.6*

The special meetings of the ministers and other workers, for prayer and consultation, were seasons to be remembered. The Lord blessed abundantly in giving light on points that seemed dark. After earnest prayer and deliberation it was decided that Elder Ballou, and Brethren Rieck and Kinney should labor during the summer in Nevada. Brother and Sister McClure, and Brother Henry Scott have gone to their field in Humboldt County. Brother Brorsen also goes to that county to work among the Danes. Brother Ings goes to the coast of Oregon shortly, all the churches on the coast will have the benefit of Elder Loughborough's labors. Brethren L. A. Scott and A. LaRue, after spending a few weeks in the San Francisco ship mission work, will go to the Sandwich Islands. Brethren Frank Lamb and Lucius Church have started for Siskiyou County. They go by private conveyance, canvassing and visiting along the road. Besides these, a good core of colporteurs and canvassers have started out into different parts of the field. We feel greatly encouraged in regard to the work on the coast. What increases our courage is the perfect harmony that prevails among the workers. The feeling of brotherly love seems to be deepening. We pray God's blessing upon these dear brethren as they go forth. We believe that he will accompany them, and give force to their effort. *SITI May 8, 1884, page 280.7*

The last Sabbath of the meeting was a good day for all present. Elder Loughborough gave a stirring discourse in the morning from *Luke 12:35, 36*. We doubt not that many made new resolves to sacrifice in the future for the cause of God, as never before. That

must be the one object of our existence here. In the afternoon Sister White took up the same subject-that of consecration to God-and carried it forward, showing how completely we belong to God, and how we rob him by living for ourselves alone. At the close of her discourse, about a hundred came forward for prayer. A large portion of these had never made a profession, and some were backsliders. There was no excitement, but very deep feeling, and the presence of the Lord was iacknowledged by all.*SITI May 8, 1884, page 280.8*

On Monday afternoon, April 28, the large congregation repaired to the Lake Merritt, where the ordinance of baptism was administered to thirty candidates. While the good meeting was the immediate cause of the forward move taken by many, the primary cause was the faithful work that has been done in the past by the missionary and Sabbath-school workers. The most of those who joined the Oakland Church, are members of the Sabbath-school. The teachers in the Sabbath-school should feel that their position is one of sacred responsibility. Although their field is not large, it is second in importance to none. The baptismal scene was very impressive.*SITI May 8, 1884, page 281.1*

At the closing meeting on Tuesday morning, Bro. N. C. McClure and Bro. Wm. Ings were set apart, by prayer and the laying on of hands, to the work of the gospel ministry. The blessing of the Lord was present in rich measure, and all felt that the ordination service was a fitting close to a most excellent meeting. To be permitted to attend throughout the entire meeting was a rare privilege. Many, we are confident, will make more rapid advancement toward the kingdom, as a result. Will there be any who go backward? May God give us all strength and courage, and protect us from the snares of Satan. E. J. W.*SITI May 8, 1884, page 281.2*

May 22, 1884

“Los Angeles Camp-Meeting” The Signs of the Times, 10, 20.

E. J. Waggoner

By the time this report issues from the press, this meeting, now two-thirds over, will be closed. Of course we cannot yet speak of results, yet we can make a good estimate of what will be accomplished. *SITI May 22, 1884, page 313.1*

The meeting was appointed in rather an unfavorable time for a full attendance of our people. This county has had three or four times its usual amount of rain the past season, and, as a consequence, farmers have been delayed in putting in their crops. The ground is just now in suitable condition for cultivation, and the people think that if this time is not improved they will raise no crops this year. The attendance of our own people is, therefore, very small. We regret this very much, for those in this part of the State have never before been permitted to meet with others of the same faith in camp-meeting. We cannot but think that if they had had this privilege, and could know the importance of such gatherings, or they can receive instruction concerning the dangers and duties of our time, there would have been a large attendance. Satan knows the importance of these meetings, and will throw hindrances in our way. He is an arch-deceiver, and can magnify a mole-hill into a mountain when it stands between us and duty. Very often it happens that things that seem to be in the natural order of events, perhaps ordered by Providence, have been gotten out by Satan for the express purpose of depriving us of a blessing. We need to be careful not to be deceived. *SITI May 22, 1884, page 313.2*

But notwithstanding the meager attendance of our own people, the meeting has been in many respects a success. We have not attended a camp-meeting in California where there was so large and regular an outside attendance. God has seemed to give us a favor with the people, and a good impression is being made. The daily papers, of which there are four in the city, have been very kind in giving us favorable notices, reporting our meetings, etc. There has not been a word of adverse criticism. The order of the ground is

commended, and surprise expressed at the size of the camp which to us seems so small.*SITI May 22, 1884, page 313.3*

We believe that it is in the order of God's providence that this meeting is held. Its effect will be to give character and permanence to the work in this section. There is no better field for labor in the State than Los Angeles; it is indeed a missionary field, and it will now be easier to reach the people than ever before. As we see the abundant opening, we feel constrained to pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers. Would that all our brethren in the State might awaken to the necessity of the time, and be preparing to fill the openings which God is preparing for us. Our College should be more than filled, and it should be so relieved from financial embarrassment that it can provide accommodation for all who may desire to attend. We often pray for the spread of the message, as though there were some failure on the part of the Lord, and he must begin to work, when the fact is that he is away ahead of us, and is waiting for us to get faith enough to walk out where he leads. God is more anxious for the salvation of souls than we are. Let us all pray the Lord to send forth laborers, and then have a hand in answering our own prayers.*SITI May 22, 1884, page 313.4*

The burden of this meeting has been to entrust the little company present in the practical duties, to give them a familiarity with the workings of the cause, and to awaken living faith and the promises of God. The timely testimony of Sister White has been well received. If it shall be heeded the Lord will work wonderfully for his people in this part of the field. Brethren pray for the work here. E. J. W. *Los Angeles. May 15. SITI May 22, 1884, page 313.5*

May 29, 1884

“Southern California Camp-Meeting” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 21.

E. J. Waggoner

There is not much concerning this meeting, to be added to our report of last week. The time was fully occupied with meetings, as is customary at our camp-meetings. The days were devoted to Bible-readings and instruction concerning our important work. Each evening there was a sermon, which was listened to by a large number not of our faith. The interest was good until the close. As an immediate result of this meeting, twenty-two signed the covenant to keep all the “commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus,” and eleven presented themselves as candidates for baptism.*SITI May 29, 1884, page 336.1*

The little company at Los Angeles were very much encouraged, and feel determined to take hold of the work with new energy. As proof of this, an old debt which had hung over their missionary Society was lifted, and their club of SIGNS was increased from ten to fifty copies, and the money all pledged. When our people all learn the power of little sums when combined, and adopt the Bible plan of systematically laying aside certain sums, as God has prospered them, we shall see the work increase beyond all our expectations.*SITI May 29, 1884, page 336.2*

Elders Healey, Israel, and Briggs, together with a large corp of canvassers and colporteurs, remain in Los Angeles to carry forward the work, and take advantage of the good impression that has already been made. May the Lord prosper them in all their efforts. E. J. W.*SITI May 29, 1884, page 336.3*

June 5, 1884

“The Sabbath-School. *Acts, Chapter 20:24-27:14*” The Signs of the Times, 10, 22.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST.-JUNE 15.
ACTS, *CHAPTER 20:24-27:14*

Our last lesson closed with Paul's speech before Agrippa. The last two verses of this defense (*Acts 26:22, 23*), are worthy of more extended notice than the limited space last week allowed. We quote: "Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both too small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show a light unto the people, and to the Gentiles." *SITI June 5, 1884, page 342.1*

These verses alone are sufficient to refute the somewhat prevalent idea that the doctrine of immortality through Christ was unknown to the Old Testament writers. The apostles were not foolish enough to make assertions without any authority to back them up. Paul himself had written, "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord." *2 Corinthians 4:5*. But their only means of proving Jesus to be the Messiah, were the prophecies. They could testify that one Jesus of Nazareth had been crucified and raised from the dead, but what of it? This would have availed nothing, had they not been able to prove from the Old Testament, the only Scripture then in existence, that these very things were predicted to occur at a definite time, and for a special purpose. Both Moses and the prophets declared, not only that Christ should suffer, but also the reason for his suffering. Even before Moses, we learn that the gospel had been preached to Abraham. *Galatians 3:8. SITI June 5, 1884, page 342.2*

Verse 23 has been the source of much perplexity and controversy. It is certain that many were raised from the dead before Christ was—Lazarus, the son of the widow of Nain, and others—even hundreds of

years before he came to earth. Many, to avoid this seeming contradiction of facts, have concluded that the text means that Christ was the first who should rise to immortality. But the text does not say so, and we have no means of proving that such is the case. The Revised Version follows the original more closely in this instance than does the King James. It reads thus: "How that the Christ must suffer, and how that he first by the resurrection of the dead should proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles." Not that Christ should be the first absolutely to rise from the dead, but to proclaim through that resurrection light to the world. *SITI June 5, 1884, page 342.3*

There were many that were raised prior to the time of Christ, but their resurrection gave no pledge that another would be raised. And they themselves were raised only by virtue of the promise that Christ would pass through the gates of death and come forth a triumphant conqueror, bearing the keys of death and the grave. This promise was made before any man had fallen under the power of death; he was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world. But God "callesth those things which be not as though they were." A thing promised by him is just as sure as though already fulfilled. With this thought in mind we may even consider that Christ was actually the first to rise from the dead, for his resurrection was as well assured as was his death; and he was "slain from the foundation of the world." And since this promise was the pledge of immortality, it is a matter of no more wonder that man should be raised to immortality before the time of Christ than that they should be raised from the dead at all. *SITI June 5, 1884, page 342.4*

We do not say that all who were raised were made immortal (of this we are not informed), but there is certainly nothing in this text to forbid the idea that some were made immortal. We know that some, as Enoch and Elijah, went to Heaven without seeing death-were made immortal-but this was only by virtue of the same promise, for immortality is brought to light only through the gospel. *2 Timothy 1:10*. Their translation was possible only because the resurrection of Jesus was an assured fact (by promise), and the same power that made them immortal through translation, could make others immortal through a resurrection. *SITI June 5, 1884, page 342.5*

When Paul touched upon the resurrection from the dead, Festus cried out, "Paul, thou art beside thyself; much learning doth make thee mad." This preaching was to him foolishness. There was nothing in philosophy that could explain the fact of a resurrection. He had doubtless seen Paul bending over his rusty parchment copy of the Old Testament, and he concluded that intense application had turned his brain. But Paul courteously replied, "I am not mad, most noble Festus; but speak forth the words of truth in soberness." Well might he say this, for they were the words of the Bible. Philosophy is just as powerless as ever to explain the doctrine of the resurrection; its professed devotees may scoff at the simple faith of the unlearned Christian; but it is nevertheless true that the words of truth and reason are to be found, above all other places, in the word of God. The doctrine of the resurrection is a most reasonable one, not because it can be grasped by human reason, but because it is founded upon the unchanging word of the eternal God. It is consistent with the highest reason to believe what he says, whether we understand it or not.*SITI June 5, 1884, page 342.6*

Paul could appeal to Agrippa as he could not to Festus. "Believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest." Since he understood and believed the prophets, and Paul had shown their accurate fulfillment in the person and work of Christ, his declaration, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian," was almost a necessary consequence. Had it not been for his wicked heart, the source of unbelief, he could have omitted the "almost." We do not believe, with some, that these words of Agrippa were uttered in a sneering manner, but that they were forced from him, even against his will, by the power of the apostle's reasoning.*SITI June 5, 1884, page 342.7*

The reply of Paul showed him to be at once a perfect gentleman and a perfect Christian. "I would to God, that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost and altogether such as I am except these bonds." If Paul had passed his life among courtiers, he could not have framed a more delicate and forcible rejoinder. And this shows that communion with God and his word may be depended upon to give men a true polish, not excelled by the most skilled worldly diplomat. But how many professed

Christians are there who would dare make the reply that Paul made?*SITI June 5, 1884, page 342.8*

How many are living so near to God, leading such holy lives, as to be able to say to all around them “I would to God that you were altogether such as I am”? I fear that the most of us would hesitate. And yet Paul had attained no height of godliness that is not possible to all. It is not only the privilege but the duty of all to be like Christ, so that when he sits as a refiner and purifier of silver, he may rejoice to see his own image reflected in us, that when he shall appear we may be able to see him as he is. E. J. W.*SITI June 5, 1884, page 342.9*

“Romans 13:1-10” The Signs of the Times, 10, 22.

E. J. Waggoner

NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.

JUNE 22.-Romans 13:1-10.

Verse 1: “Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers, for there is no power but of God; the powers that be far ordained of God.” By the “higher powers” is meant those who are in authority in the earth. Submission to authority is one of the chief requisites; it lies at the foundation of all goodness. It is everywhere taught in the Bible. The child that is disobedient to his parents, or the man who despises the authority of the Government, cannot be submissive to the will of God. To teach children perfect submission to authority when they are young, is to prepare them to be good citizens of the State, and humble followers of God.*SITI June 5, 1884, page 343.1*

“The powers that be are ordained of God.” That is, God has appointed that there should be governments in the earth. Paul has reference more to authority in the abstract than to individual rulers. God has ordered that there should be government; but it does not follow that the men in authority are always men that he would approve. We read that in the redeemed estate there will be nations and kings, who will bring their glory and honor into the New Jerusalem. *Revelation 21*. We may learn, therefore, that God has no sympathy with anarchy and confusion. Those who are trying to

overthrow existing forms of government are not doing work which God approves; a Christian cannot engage in such a work. And right here it is worth while to notice that socialists, communists, and the nihilists are almost invariably atheists, as much opposed to the government of God as they are to earthly powers. *SITI June 5, 1884, page 343.2*

“Whosoever therefore resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God.” These words of Paul are greatly misapprehended by many. They do not teach that we are to obey every human ordinance. No Christian is justified in *resisting* authority, and yet it may be absolutely necessary for him to disobey the commands of rulers. For instance: The apostles were often commanded by those highest in authority not to preach in the name of Jesus, but they paid no attention to this command, saying, “We ought to obey God rather than men.” Here was a case where the laws of men work in opposition to those of God. Such laws they were warranted in disobeying, but we will see that they did not resist authority. They said nothing against the rulers, and did not try to create insurrection among the people; they submitted to authority and took their punishment without a word of complaint. When the hearts of the people were with the apostles, in consequence of the wonderful miracles they had performed, they might easily have organized a force that would have compelled the rulers to revoke their unjust decrees, or even to flee from office. In the course which they did pursue, all Christians have an example to follow. *SITI June 5, 1884, page 343.3*

In the ninth and tenth verses we find a statement of our duties as citizens, and of the rights of rulers. The last five commandments are quoted as comprising the whole of the law, with the statement that “if there be any other commandment it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” To do this, Paul says, is to fulfill the law. Now he has not said anything about idolatry, image-worship, profane swearing, or Sabbath-breaking. Why not? Was it because he regarded these things as of no consequence? No; but because he was writing about our duty as citizens and not concerning our special duty to God. That this is not all the law, we know from our Saviour’s words. He places, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul,

and with all thy mind,” first, as being greater than the one which Paul quotes, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” Paul does not repudiate that first and great commandment, as is abundantly shown in his writings elsewhere; but he only quotes so much of the law as it is applicable to the case in hand. And there is a thought here for those who would have special legislation by earthly rulers on matters of religion. If all our duty as citizens of the State is comprehended in this thing, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,” then it surely follows that all the power of the rulers of the State are comprised in seeing that the people obey that law. To this extent they are God’s ministers (servants). He intrusts to them the enforcing of laws, the violation of which would work ill to man; beyond this they have no right to go. *SITI June 5, 1884, page 343.4*

“He that loveth another [literally, *the* other] hath fulfilled the law.” That is, he obeys all the law that relates merely to our duty to man. No one can tell another, steal from him, bear false witness against him, violate the chastity of any of his family, or covet his goods, and at the same time love him. If he loves his neighbor as he does himself, he will not offend in any of these points, and then he will be doing all that human laws can require of him. But after he does this, there yet remains his duty to God, as covered by the first and great commandment. If he does not fulfill this law, he is amenable to God alone; and if those that resist earthly rulers receive to themselves damnation, who can measure the guilt of him who refuses to render to God the honor that is due him? E. J. W. *SITI June 5, 1884, page 343.5*

“Our Sabbath-School Department” The Signs of the Times, 10, 22.

E. J. Waggoner

It has been our aim to make this department of our paper one of general interest. From the very nature of our work the Sabbath-school department of the SIGNS must be different from that of any other paper. The SIGNS is a missionary paper. Devoted to an exposition of the great truths of the Bible, especially those for the last days, and as such it goes to all parts of the world, and is read by all classes of people. Its circulation is not confined to our own people, but thousands not of our faith, and many with no well-

defined belief in Christianity, read it with interest. Of the thousands of readers of the SIGNS, comparatively few study the Sabbath-school lessons upon which it comments, the great majority using the international series; and those who study the lessons published in the *Youth's Instructor*, are so widely scattered that many do not get the SIGNS in time to make the notes of the immediate use in preparing their lesson.*SITI June 5, 1884, page 345.1*

All these things have been taken into account in preparing our Sabbath-school department, and we have endeavored to make the notes and comments of such a nature as will interest the general reader. The mission of the SIGNS is such that we cannot afford to have any part of it of merely local interest. We have evidence from Sabbath-school teachers and scholars that this department has been useful to them in their work; and we know that it has not been unappreciated by the larger class whom we have had in mind.*SITI June 5, 1884, page 345.2*

But there are many who study the International lessons, who would derive more direct benefit if the SIGNS contained notes on that series also, and we have decided to meet this want. As all doubtless know, the International lessons are necessarily non-sectarian, being simply portions of the Bible selected by the Lesson committee. While all the Sunday-schools in the country study the same portion of Scripture at the same time, each denomination or journal may publish its own notes and comments. Since the SIGNS is a Bible expositor, to comment on these lessons will be directly in the line of our work. We therefore begin this week to add these to our own Lesson notes. To those unacquainted with this series, we will say now for all time, that there are only twelve lessons in each quarter; each school can use whatever it desires for the thirteenth lesson. There will therefore be no notes next week.*SITI June 5, 1884, page 345.3*

As in the past, we will endeavor to make these notes of interest and profit to all; we shall also get them out in time so that those who desire may use them in preparing their lessons. We believe that this move will be appreciated by all our present readers, and by thousands yet to come. E. J. W.*SITI June 5, 1884, page 345.4*

June 12, 1884

“God’s Seventh Day Man’s First Day” The Signs of the Times, 10, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

There is nothing that can be proved so conclusively that no one can find a chance to cavil, if his inclination or selfish interest prompts him to do so. The infidel Hume once said that if there were anything in the forty-seventh proposition of Euclid that crossed any person’s selfish interests, or limited the power of any man or class of men, there would be hundreds who would dispute the mathematical demonstration that the square of the hypotenuse of the right-angled triangle is equal to the sum of the squares of the other two sides. And so it is. It is not difficult, with the mass of mankind, to gain their assent to the most absurd theories, if their passions or business interests lead the way; but it requires more than mere human reason to thoroughly convince a man of the plainest truth, against his inclinations. Only the grace of God can subdue the evil heart of unbelief. *SITI June 12, 1884, page 360.1*

By no other means than by the existence of the principle just cited, can we account for some of the (so-called) arguments against the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. One of the weakest of these is that “the day which is observed by the majority of people is indeed the true Sabbath of the fourth commandment,” since “God’s seventh day was Adam’s first day.” We would not think this objection worthy of notice in this paper, had not several correspondents especially requested it. *SITI June 12, 1884, page 360.2*

What is meant by the expression “God’s seventh day”? Of course nothing else can be met but the seventh day of time, according to God’s count. This, it is claimed, is man’s first day, because he could not have any knowledge of time that had passed before his creation! To be consistent, the advocates of this theory should keep as their Sabbath, the seventh day, counting by seventh from the day of their birth. If this chanced to be on Wednesday, then they should keep Tuesday, for how do they know that there was any such thing as time before they were born? It will be replied that

others have kept a record of time, and we accept their testimony and reckoning. Exactly so; and is it not possible that the same God who imparted to Adam the knowledge of the Sabbath, could inform him of the fact that there was a measurement of time before he was created? It seems that Moses found out a great deal about things that occurred before his own time, even as far back as the very beginning, because he was willing to take the Lord's word for it; and the first day of Adam's existence is rather early for him to be setting up his own reckoning in opposition to that of his Maker. *SITI June 12, 1884, page 360.3*

But it is strange that none of those who have stumbled at this objection raised by their leaders, have never questioned the truth of the assumed fact. They have never thought to inquire if God's seventh day was indeed man's first day. This point can be settled by reading the first chapter of Genesis, which contains a record of the transactions of each day of the creation week. There we learn that man and the lower animals were created on the *sixth* day of the week. If Adam, then, as is claimed, commenced an individual reckoning of time, the seventh day of his week would have been the fifth day of the week according to God's reckoning. No one can deny this. We know it is claimed that Adam was created late on the sixth day, and that the next day was really his first day. Really, it was no such thing, we are not informed as the exact hour of the day when Adam was created, nor does it matter; we do know that he was created on the sixth day, and, consequently, that was his first day of life. If a child is born on the twelfth of June, the twelfth and not the thirteenth of June in each succeeding year is celebrated as his birth-day, even though he were born late in the afternoon. *SITI June 12, 1884, page 360.4*

Now why do not the advocates of the theory in question stick to the facts in the case? Simply because the facts would demolish their theory. If the facts were adhered to, they would find in them no semblance of an excuse for Sunday-keeping, and it would not be for their interest to advocate the observance of the fifth or the sixth day of the week. *SITI June 12, 1884, page 360.5*

The absurdity of the theory is apparent enough, but we want to consider it a moment in the light of the fourth commandment. That

says, "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in yet thou shalt not do any work." Did God mean by this the seventh day, or the first day? "Both," say our friends; "he meant the seventh day according to his own private count, but the first day according to man's reckoning." We have heard that the Jesuits say a thing that they do not mean, and which is not true, and making mental reservation, or repeat the truth in an undertone; but this theory charges God with the same duplicity. The commandment was spoken to and for man, and must of course, be in the language to which men are accustomed, otherwise it would be meaningless. Now if God's seventh day was Adam's first day, then man's seventh day must be God's sixth day; and, this theory being true, it follows that the fourth commandment enjoins the observance of neither the first nor the seventh day, but the sixth! *SITI June 12, 1884, page 361.1*

But this, and similar absurd theories, arise from the assumption that the Sabbath is a human institution, and that God has nothing much to do with it, except to advise man to rest when he feels like it. The fact is, that it is God's day upon which we are to rest, - the one upon which he rested, and which he blessed and set apart. It is "*the seventh day*" which is "the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." Man could not make a day holy if he tried; but God made the Sabbath holy, and he commands man not to desecrate it. Man had nothing to do with making the Sabbath; his only duty in regard to it is to keep it. *SITI June 12, 1884, page 361.2*

One word, in closing, to our brethren who may sometimes be at a loss to know how to answer an objector. Do not hold yourselves under obligations to refute at sight every assemblage of words that may be called an argument. Ask the objector first to *prove* his proposition, and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred he will demonstrate that there was nothing to refute. In the remaining instance you may need to aid him by quoting a few texts of Scripture. E. J. W. *SITI June 12, 1884, page 361.3*

"Facts Against Supposition" The Signs of the Times, 10, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

In the SIGNS of March 6, the editor, commenting on a sermon on Spiritualism, penned the following words: "We record our emphatic denial of the assertion that the Scriptures give any instances of the spirits of the departed reappearing; and we invite any one to point out to us the texts wherein such reappearing is supposed to be given." *SITI June 12, 1884, page 361.4*

Had the call been for texts which *prove* the return of departed spirits, eternity might pass before a response could be made, the word "supposed" gives the Spiritualist considerable latitude; for there is no limit to what a man may "suppose" about a Bible text, if he only gives loose rein to his fancy. A gentleman from Boston, taking advantage of the above invitation, sends us his supposition as follows: - *SITI June 12, 1884, page 361.5*

"Permit me to call your attention to one of the many to be found in the Bible. *Luke 16, verses 9, 12, 14; Luke 24, verses 14, 29, 30, 31, 36; John 20, verses 19, 20, 26, 27, and 29.* The latter part of the 29th verse contains the following: 'Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.' To what extent the above will apply to those of the present day, who have the opportunity to see and believe, and won't do either, remains to be seen." *SITI June 12, 1884, page 361.6*

We are willing to give our correspondent credit for believing without seeing, for we doubt much if he has ever seen some of the texts to which he refers. If he had, he certainly would not have to used them. We refer to those in *Luke 16*, not one of which contains even the most indirect allusion to a spirit either present or absent. As we said before, though, there is no accounting for what a man may "suppose," especially if he is wandering in the fog of Spiritualism. *SITI June 12, 1884, page 361.7*

In the references made to *Luke 24* and *John 20*, our friend is equally unfortunate. These texts speak of the appearing of Jesus to his disciples after his resurrection; but they say nothing about the return of his spirit. Jesus was then alive, not dead; and we do not question the fact that living beings may appear to whomsoever they please. *Luke 24:36*, one of the verses referred to, says: "And as they thus spake, *Jesus himself* [not his spirit] stood in the midst of

them.” And *verses 38 and 39*, not referred to, plainly declare that it was not a spiritual manifestation. They read thus: “And he said unto them, Why are ye trouble? and why do thoughts are rise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.” We are inclined to think that it is far easier to believe some things without having seen them, than after the light of truth has shown clearly upon them. *SITI June 12, 1884, page 361.8*

We are well aware that Spiritualists, and many who are pleased to style themselves orthodox, claim that the resurrection is simply the act of the soul or spirit leaving the body at the death of the latter. In such a case there would be no resurrection from the dead; there would, in fact, be no death. But the Scriptures invariably speak of a resurrection “from the dead.” Paul was willing to suffer all things if by any means he might attain unto the “resurrection from the dead;” literally, from “dead ones.” *Philippians 3:11*. When Jesus was transfigured before his disciples, he charged them to tell no man of it until after he was “risen again from the dead.” *Matthew 17:9*. And this resurrection was not the escaping of the spirit at the dissolution of the body, for we are told that “he began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders, and of the chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again.” *Mark 8:31*. Those who claim that the real Christ did not die, or that it was his undying spirit that appeared to the disciples the third day after the crucifixion, must squarely deny the above and many other Scripture texts. *SITI June 12, 1884, page 361.9*

And right here we would drop a word of warning, and urge upon all the necessity of a well-grounded, intelligent faith in the Scriptures. There is no doctrine upon which it is more necessary that we be firmly settled than that of the State of the dead. Error is wonderfully blinding and seductive. We may think that we are proof against temptation on this point, but the human heart is in itself deceitful, and Satan knows how to take advantage of it, if it is left unguarded. Our only hope of safety is in having a *thorough* knowledge of the true teachings of the inspired word, and in being led by the Spirit of God, that when we are brought into the conflict with Satan, we may meet him at every point with, “It is written.” We are to resist him

steadfast 'in the faith." *SITI June 12, 1884, page 361.10*

Our correspondent says: "Your paper is good in many ways. Pray be good enough to spend half as much time in the investigation of Spiritualism as you have in attacking it, and give the readers the result of your investigations." Why, we have spent a great deal more time in the investigation of Spiritualism than we have in attacking it. But we don't propose to investigate in the way that our friend wishes us to. We do not like to investigate in the dark. We have studied the Bible, and we find Spiritualism there exposed so plainly that we have no need to go nearer. As we said, error is blinding; and those who investigate Spiritualism by going into it, or by going where spiritual manifestations are given, will do so at the peril of their souls. It is simply putting themselves on the devil's ground and inviting him to try his power upon them. Christ will not accompany us when we needlessly go on to the enemy's ground, and without him human strength is powerless against the prince of darkness. *SITI June 12, 1884, page 361.11*

The man who is groping about blindfolded in a dark cavern does not have nearly so good a chance to know what it is like, as the man does who stands outside with open eyes, and holding in his hand a lamp whose beams shine into its utmost recesses. The man who sinks in the ocean knows nothing of its depth, compared with the one who stands secure in a boat and casts a sounding line. So the man who ventures into the mazes of Spiritualism, is no proper judge of its real nature; while the man who holds in his hand the lamp of God's word can see all its terrible dangers, - dangers all the more terrible because they are so seductive. *SITI June 12, 1884, page 361.12*

We do not need to take poison in order to know its deadly character. We learn its nature and effects from books, and are therewith content. And so we would say again to all: Study the word of God carefully; and earnestly and continually pray, "Lead us not into temptation." E. J. W. *SITI June 12, 1884, page 361.13*

June 19, 1884

“The Sabbath-School. Acts, Chapter 28” The Signs of the Times, 10, 24.

E. J. Waggoner

“And the barbarous people showed us no little kindness.” “The Greeks regarded all as barbarians who did not speak their language, and applied the name to all other nations but their own. It does not denote, as it does sometimes with us, people of savage, uncultivated, and cruel habits, but simply those whose speech was unintelligible. See *1 Corinthians 14:11*. The island is supposed to have been peopled at first by the Phœcians, afterward by the Phœnicians, and afterward by a colony from Carthage. The language of the Maltese was that of Africa.”-*Barnes. SITI June 19, 1884, page 374.1*

“And when Paul had gathered a bundle of sticks.” This was perfectly in keeping with Paul’s character. He was never idle. He was the foremost preacher of the age, commissioned directly by the Lord, yet he was not above engaging in the most menial work when it was necessary. In Paul we find all the characteristics of a true missionary. He was able to adapt himself to all circumstances. His knowledge was varied. He could preach the truth in such a way as to make kings tremble, could direct the management of the ship, and control a mutinous crew, and when shipwrecked, could at once provide for the comfort of himself and companions. He was what we would call a man of resources.*SITI June 19, 1884, page 374.2*

When Paul reached Rome he acted with characteristic promptness. Within three days he called the chief of the Jews together to lay his case before them. Although he was manifestly in the hands of God, he did not think it unnecessary to taking the precaution for his defense. It was best for him to get the goodwill of these Jews as far as possible before the case came to trial, by disabusing their minds of wrong impressions which they might have gained. He asserts his innocence in these words: “Though I have committed nothing against the people, or the customs of our fathers, yet was I delivered prisoner from Jerusalem into the hands of the Romans.” This was all strictly true. He had not done anything against his own

nation. On the contrary, he had devoted much time and strength to the collection of alms for the poor of Judea. And he had really done nothing against the customs of the fathers-the special point of which he was accused. It was while he was engaged in the performance of duties enjoined by the ceremonial law that he had been arrested. While it is true that Paul had mingled with the Gentiles, and had held that circumcision was a matter of indifference, he was entirely innocent of the charge brought against him, and it is of this that Paul speaks. It is a common form of speech, when one is falsely accused, to say, "I have committed no crime, nor been guilty of any wrong act." By this the speaker is not understood as claiming that he never did anything wrong in his life-time, but that he is innocent of the thing brought against him. *SITI June 19, 1884, page 374.3*

We would not be understood as intimating that Paul had committed any wrong act at any time, although he had, during his ministry, done many things which a Jew of that age would not have done. But he refers to the fathers, and we have evidence that the exclusiveness which led the later Jews to refuse all intercourse with Gentiles was not shared by them. It is worthy of note, however, that even the Pharisees, those zealous advocates of law, never brought any charge of immorality against Paul. He was never accused of breaking the Sabbath or of any other violation of the ten commandments. This is a strong evidence as is needed to prove that Paul was always a devout Sabbath-keeper. If he had not kept the Sabbath of the commandment-the seventh day of the week-his enemies would have speedily become aware of it. Such a flagrant violation of the law would not be allowed to pass unreprieved. And the fact that when they were clamoring for his blood, and inventing grievous charges against him, they did not accuse him of Sabbath-breaking, shows that Paul had never even technically violated the fourth commandment. He could truly say to the Sanhedrim, "have lived in all good conscience before God until this day." *Acts 23:1*. He believed "all things which are written in the law and in the prophets;" and what he believed he acted upon. So we see that when Paul preached in the synagogues of Antioch, Thessalonica, and Corinth on the Sabbath-day, it was not an accidental occurrence, but in perfect harmony with his life-long habit and settled convictions. E. J. W. *SITI June 19, 1884, page 374.4*

“An Important Question” The Signs of the Times, 10, 24.

E. J. Waggoner

“And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. He saith unto him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honour thy father and thy mother; and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. The young man saith unto him, All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet? Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me. But when the young man heard that saying, he went away sorrowful: for he had great possessions.” *Matthew 19:16-22. SITI June 19, 1884, page 377.1*

The question asked by the young ruler is one that has been asked by thousands, and one that should interest every person. Life is a boon of inestimable value; men will spend the earnings of years, and travel to the utmost limits of the globe, in order to prolong their lives for a few years. How eagerly, then, should they grasp anything which will lengthen out their lives to all eternity. It is indeed wonderful that so few manifest an interest in that which pertains to their eternal welfare, while they are so zealous for life and happiness for a short time. In this the majority of mankind manifest only the wisdom of the infant who seizes the glittering toy, and rejects the infinitely more valuable bag of treasure. But there are some who are anxiously inquiring, “What must I do to be saved?” And to such the words of our Lord himself on this subject must be of all-absorbing interest. *SITI June 19, 1884, page 377.2*

The reader will notice that Jesus did not at once answer the young man’s question, but asked him one on another subject. “Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is God.” Our Saviour did not mean to intimate by this that he was not good. He himself said that it was his meat to do the will of the Father (*John 4:34*); and again he said to his disciples, “If ye keep my

commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love." *John 15:10*. To the Jews he said, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" (*John 8:46*), thus demanding the closest scrutiny of his life. Paul says that he "knew no sin" (*2 Corinthians 5:21*); Peter says of him that he "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth" (*1 Peter 2:22*); and even the devils acknowledged him to be "the Holy One of God." *Mark 1:24*. His character on earth was the same that it is now as our High Priest, "holy, harmless, and undefiled, separate from sinners." *Hebrews 7:26*. He was absolutely good; the perfection and embodiment of goodness. *SITI June 19, 1884, page 377.3*

This being the case, we can understand his words, "there is none good but one, that is God," as nothing but a statement of the fact that he himself was entitled to be called God. If there is but one that is good, viz., God, and Christ is good, then Christ must be God. And this agrees with what the prophet had said of Christ: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, *The mighty God*, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." *Isaiah 9:6*. John also said: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." *John 1:1*. Since he is the Son of God, he partakes of the divine attributes; and so Paul says that he occupies a more exalted position than the angels because "he hath *by inheritance* a more excellent name than they." *Hebrews 1:4*. He was never on probation, as a candidate for life, as are all created beings, but has "life in himself" (*John 5:26*), being the creator of all things. *John 1:3; Colossians 1:16. SITI June 19, 1884, page 377.4*

The Father and the Son are one. *John 10:30*. Both are worthy of worship. God alone may be worshiped (*Revelation 22:8, 9*), but Christ did not refuse the adoration of his disciples. *Luke 24:52*. We are not called upon to explain the mystery of godliness, nor expected to understand it, but Christ has explained to us how he and the Father are one. In his memorable prayer for his disciples, he said: "Holy Father, keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one, *as we are one*." "And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; *that they may be one even as we are one*." *John 17:11, 22*. This oneness, then, is

that of two distinct individuals having the same thoughts, the same purposes, the same attributes. The Father and the Son were one in creating the earth, and one in the devising and carrying out of the plan of salvation. They never worked at cross purposes; and in harmony with Christ's prayer that union may exist among his disciples, Paul exhorts us to "all speak the same thing," and to "be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." *1 Corinthians 1:10. SITI June 19, 1884, page 377.5*

We understand, therefore, that when Christ addressed to the young man the words found in *Matthew 19:17*, it was because he saw that this ruler, like Nicodemus, did not appreciate the divine character of Jesus, but thought him to be a mere man. Christ penetrated the young man's thoughts, and by this question and reply revealed to him his own true nature. *SITI June 19, 1884, page 377.6*

Having incidentally settled this point, our Lord immediately answers the question, "What good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?" He did not say, "You must not do anything," but said plainly, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." The young man, greatly surprised, asked, "Which?" Being a ruler of the Jews, he had, of course, kept the law, and prided himself on the strictness with which he had heeded all its requirements. The strictness of the Pharisees, extending even to the minutest forms and ceremonies, is proverbial. The young man, doubtless, like Paul, lived under the "straitest sect" of the Jew's religion. We can therefore imagine the astonishment and assurance with which he uttered the word, "Which?" As much as to say, "Why, are there any other commandments? Have you some new ones that are not written in the law? If so, tell me what they are." Jesus calmly quotes a portion of the ten commandments, as showing that the law to which he has reference. The fact that he did not quote all of them is no proof that he did not design that all should be kept. He did not quote the first nor the third, yet no one would argue from this that Christ meant to indicate to the young man that he could worship idols or indulge in profanity and still be saved. He simply quoted enough to show that he referred to that which was regarded by all as the law, and that he had no new commandment to offer. *SITI June 19, 1884, page 377.7*

Before commenting further on the observance of the

commandments as the condition of eternal life, or the truth of the young man's reply in *verse 20*, we wish to briefly notice what this law is. In a matter of life and death it will not do to make a mistake. If the commandments are to be the test of our fitness for eternal life, we must have those commandments so clearly defined that there can be no doubt. Fortunately, this is not a difficult thing to do. In the third month after the children of Israel left Egypt, they came to the wilderness of Sinai. The Lord told them to make certain preparations, for within three days he would come down upon Mount Sinai in the sight of all the people. *Exodus 19:10, 11*. Nehemiah tells us why he thus came down: "Thou camest down also upon mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments." *Nehemiah 9:13*. His object, then, in coming down was to give the people laws of truth, good statutes. Besides this, Nehemiah says, "and commandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant." *Verse 14*. If now we can distinguish between the statutes given by the Lord himself and those given to Moses, we shall have discovered that which we seek-the condition of eternal life. *SITI June 19, 1884, page 377.8*

Returning to Exodus, we find that when the necessary preparations had been completed, the Lord did come down upon Mount Sinai, with fire and smoke, thunders and lightnings, and an earthquake. *Exodus 19:16-18*. In the *20th chapter, verses 3-17*, we find the words which the Lord spoke from the mount. In *Deuteronomy 4:11-13*, Moses rehearses the scenes of Sinai and plainly says that the words which God spoke are the ten commandments. But may it not be that there is something besides these? Let us see. In the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy, Moses, in the course of his last charge to the people, repeated in substance these ten commandments as recorded in *Exodus 20:3-17*. When he had finished the recital, he said: "These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice: and *he added no more*. And he wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me." *Deuteronomy 5:22*. *SITI June 19, 1884, page 378.1*

Of these commandments, Moses said, "And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest

in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes." *Deuteronomy 6:7, 8*. That these are the commandments, the keeping of which is the condition of eternal life, is proved by *verse 25*: "And it shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us." *SITI June 19, 1884, page 378.2*

We have now found the commandments to which our Lord referred. We are not now concerned with the particulars of the laws given to Moses, since the keeping of them is not required. "What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" is the question in which we are now interested, and those things not pertaining to this may be passed by. We now know what the law is. Next week we will consider the "Nature of the Law," to see why the keeping of it should be able to confer immortality. E. J. W. *SITI June 19, 1884, page 378.3*

June 26, 1884

“2 Samuel 6:1-12” The Signs of the Times, 10, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.

JULY 13 - 2 Samuel 6:1-12.

“Again, David gathered together all the chosen men of Israel, thirty thousand.” *Verse 1*. The sixth chapter records two great victories gained by the army of David, one over the Jebusites, and one over the Philistines. Now he once more assembles the chief of his men, but for another purpose. The ark of God was to be brought to the capital of the kingdom. *SITI June 26, 1884, page 390.1*

In order to understand this chapter, it is necessary to go back in the history of the Jews about a hundred years. In the fourth chapter of first Samuel we have the account of a great battle between the Israelites and the Philistines, in which the Israelites were conquered, and the ark, on which they had depended for safety, was captured. At that time God showed the people that the mere possession of the tables of the law would afford them no protection when they were trampling upon the law itself; that to have the thing from which God was accustomed to manifest himself, was a vain thing unless he himself was enshrined in their hearts. *SITI June 26, 1884, page 390.2*

From this overthrow the Israelites did not recover for many years. The possession of the ark, however, proved disastrous to the Philistines, as we learn from *1 Samuel 5* and *6*. God showed them that the things pertaining to his worship must not be handled irreverently. They were glad to purchase rest from the afflictions which he sent upon them, by returning the ark. When it arrived at Beth-shemesh, the men of that place were smitten, because they presumed to look into the sacred chest, and they sent to the citizens of Kirjath-jearim, requesting them to come and get it. Here it remained until the time of the present lesson. The reader will notice, by the margin of *2 Samuel 6:2*, that “Baale of Judah,” from which David sent to bring the ark, is but another name for Kirjath-

jearim.*SITI June 26, 1884, page 390.3*

“To bring up from thence the ark of God, whose name is called by the name of the Lord of hosts that dwelleth between the cherubims.” *Verse 2*. The margin of this verse gives the more literal rendering, and the one that makes sense: “To bring up the ark of God, at which the name, even the name of the Lord of hosts, was called upon.” “That dwelleth between the cherubim.” In *Exodus 25:10-22*, we have a full description of this ark, and the object for which it was used; there we find the statement that God would commune with the people from between the cherubim that were upon the mercy-seat-the cover of the ark.*SITI June 26, 1884, page 390.4*

“And they set the ark of God upon a new cart.” *Verse 3*. This was contrary to the instructions given by the Lord. How the ark was to be borne by the staves (see *Exodus 25:12-14*); the sons of Kohath were appointed to carry it and the other holy vessels, but even they were not to touch or look upon any of them. See *Numbers 4:4-15*. In no case was the ark to be placed upon a wagon. *Numbers 7:7-9*.*SITI June 26, 1884, page 390.5*

“And David and all the house of Israel played before the Lord on all manner of instruments made of fir wood, even on harps, and on psalteries, and on timbrels, and on cornets, and on cymbals.” *Verse 5*. As Dr. Clarke says, this place should be corrected from the parallel passage in *1 Chronicles 13:8*. There it is said that they played *with all their might*, on harps, etc., and that makes good sense. The Hebrew letters of the two passages are nearly identical, which doubtless accounts for the difference. The Septuagint has in this place the reading as in *1 Chronicles 13:8*, with might.*SITI June 26, 1884, page 390.6*

“And when they came to Nachon’s threshingfloor, Uzzah put forth his hand to the ark of God, and took hold of it; for the oxen shook it. And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzzah; and God smote him there for his error; and there he died by the ark of God.” *Verses 6, 7*. In this we have another illustration of how God regards his work and worship. It may seem to some that Uzzah’s punishment was too severe for so small an act, but such judgment

comes from setting up our standard instead of God's. How do we know that Uzzah's error was a small one? From the punishment that followed we would suppose that God regarded it as a great sin. Indeed, we must so regard unless we are willing to admit that God was unjust. God is just to; the punishments which he inflicts are always proportionate to the sin committed; therefore Uzzah's error must have been a grievous one. The whole proceeding was irregular, but Uzzah, in presuming to lay hands on the sacred ark; overstepped all bounds. Had not that swift punishment been meted out to him, the worship of God would have been degraded, as a common affair, and reverence for sacred things would have entirely died out among the people.*SITI June 26, 1884, page 390.7*

What was it that made that little box of wood and gold so sacred? Why was it to be approached with such awe and reverence, and only by persons duly set apart for that purpose? It was because it contained a copy of the law of God. That which God declares to be his own righteousness—a transcript of his own character—was inclosed in that ark. That law is the foundation of the government of God; it is that by which the loyalty of all creatures is tested. When men lose their reverence for that, they lose their reverence for God's Government, and for God himself. It was on this account that God had given such specific directions concerning the ark.*SITI June 26, 1884, page 391.1*

How do we know what is right and what is wrong? It is evident that it is only by being told. And what warrant have we for calling any violation of one of God's commands a little sin? Do we not by so doing become judges of God? The lesson to be learned from this circumstance is that to disregard any one of God's requirements is a heinous sin; that sin of any kind is exceedingly displeasing to God. Familiarity with sin hardens us; we learn to excuse it, and our standard lowerd to correspond with existing circumstances. But God is sinless, and the more sin there is committed the more odious it becomes to him. If we, then, desire to do what is right, and thus displease God, it is evident that we must in all cases accept the standard of right and wrong which God gives. Our feelings are no criterion whatever, for that which we look upon as trivial, may be regarded by God is a terrible sin.*SITI June 26, 1884, page 391.2*

It is by his law that God reveals his will. Two texts will prove this. “I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea by law is within my heart.” *Psalms 40:8*. Here we find that to have the law of God in the heart, is to cheerfully do all his will. Again Paul says: “Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law.” *Romans 2:17, 18*. Here we learn that those who know the will of God are those who are instructed out of the law. But God does not change; we have his word for this. His will concerning man is just the same now as it ever was. This being the case, it follows that his law is always the same. And so it is. Christ said: “It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail.” *Luke 16:17*. And what has this to do with the lesson? Simply this: “If God regarded it as so terrible an offense merely to touch the receptacle which contained his law, how much to look upon those who dare to trample upon the law itself? The pope of Rome has impiously presumed to change the law, especially that portion which enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week, and millions of people have accepted his act. It is considered all right to labor upon the day which God sanctified, because “everybody does so.” But the Lord says: “Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil.” We are to make God’s law, and not our feelings, or the practice of the multitude, our standard of right and wrong. “Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily [as in the case of Uzzah], therefore the heart of the sons of man is fully set in them to do evil.” *Ecclesiastes 8:11*. But judgment, though long delayed, is sure to come, and when it does, it will be according to righteousness, or, in other words, according to the law of God. E. J. W. *SITI June 26, 1884, page 391.3*

“Nature of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 10, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we considered Christ’s words, “If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments,” and found that the law of God-the ten commandments spoken on Mount Sinai-are the commandments referred to. In harmony with this, we have the words of Christ through the beloved disciple: “Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and

enter in through the gates into the city.” *Revelation 22:14*. We now want to examine this law, in order to learn its character. *SITI June 26, 1884, page 392.1*

First we quote the words of David: “The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul.” *Psalms 19:7*. A perfect law, if kept, will form a perfect character. If a man has a perfect character, he is a perfect man, and that is all that God requires of any of us; all that he can require of any one. Paul also adds his testimony to that of David, and says that “the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.” *Romans 7:12*. And this also agrees with the words of Nehemiah, that the Lord, on Mount Sinai, gave “true laws [laws of truth, margin], good statutes and commandments.” *SITI June 26, 1884, page 392.2*

This idea of the perfection of the ten commandments is more fully expressed by David in *Psalms 119:172*: “My tongue shall speak of thy word; for all thy commandments our righteousness.” They are not simply good; they are righteousness itself. We remember that Moses said of these commandments, “they shall be in thine heart,” and that we should talk of them at all times. But it is as true of a man now as when Solomon wrote, that “as he thinketh in his heart, so is he.” *Proverbs 23:7*. Therefore if a man continuously meditates upon a law that is perfect righteousness, he can but become righteous. *SITI June 26, 1884, page 392.3*

David says that the commandments are righteousness, but the Lord, through the prophet Isaiah, gives us a still deeper insight into their perfection: “Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath: for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner: but my salvation shall be for ever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished.” *Isaiah 51:6*. *SITI June 26, 1884, page 392.4*

If any reader fails to connect this verse with *Psalms 119:172*, and thus learn what the righteousness that shall not be abolished is, he can satisfy himself that is the law of God, by reading the next verse: “Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law.” *Isaiah 51:7*. Now that we see that the

commandments are God's righteousness, it needs no argument to convince us that they cannot be abolished. Abolish the righteousness of God! It would be equivalent to abolishing God himself. The thing is an impossibility. *SITI June 26, 1884, page 392.5*

It is not, however, the fact that God's law cannot be abolished, that we wish to call your especial attention, but that it is God's righteousness. God is all righteousness-perfection-and therefore the law must be a transcript of his character. God wanted man to be like himself, righteous, but how could poor, fallen man know what righteousness is? He must needs have a perfect guide to direct his actions. God could not associate with man, and thus teach them what is righteousness, for they could not stand even his voice, much less the sight of his person. So he wrote out a description of his character, in words suited to the comprehension of human beings, and committed it to us. Christ tells us that the ten commandments hang from the great principle of love, and God is love. By studying them and obeying them we become like them, or what is the same thing, like God. We write this with all reverence. We would not be understood that any human being can approach the perfection of God in any particular; but God himself says, "Be ye holy, for I am holy;" and Christ says, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect." *Matthew 5:48*. We are to become sinless and pure, and even then God in his goodness will be infinitely above us. *SITI June 26, 1884, page 392.6*

But some one may say, "I do not see anything about the ten commandments worthy to be called a transcript of God's character. It seems like degrading God to say that they are his righteousness." That simply shows that you have not meditated upon them sufficiently to become acquainted with them. Paul says that the law is spiritual, and spiritual things are only spiritually discerned. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him." We see beauty only in that which we love; and Paul says that the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." *Romans 8:7*. But when the carnal mind has been subdued, and the man has yielded to the requirement of the law, he can exclaim with Paul, "I delight in the law of God after the inward man;" *Romans 7:22*; or

with David, "O how love I thy law! it is my meditation all the day." *Psalm 119:97. SITI June 26, 1884, page 392.7*

The better acquainted we become with God's law, the greater it appears to us. David thought much on the law, and he said, "I have seen an end of all perfection; but thy commandment is exceeding brought." *Psalm 119:96.* It is so broad that it covers every act that any rational creature can perform, and every thought that the mind of man can conceive. For Bible proof of this we read: "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart." *Hebrews 4:12.* There is no sin either of word, deed, or thought, which the law of God will not search out and condemn. How necessary, then, that we may make it our constant study. As we do not wish to cherish sin, and thus fail of eternal life, we must understand in all cases just what sin is; and to this end let us never cease to pray with the psalmist: "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." E. J. W. *SITI June 26, 1884, page 392.8*

"The Seventh Day Is the Sabbath" The Signs of the Times, 10, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

A card lately received from Mendocino County, Cal., informs us that the writer was somewhat disturbed by reading what the SIGNS has to say on the Sabbath question, but that after searching the Scriptures, and reading Baptist publications (especially the latter), he is satisfied that we are wrong. The writer also promises to send us papers containing a sermon on the subject of the Sabbath, which he wishes us to read with care, looking up the references, and thinks that it will convince us of our error. *SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.1*

The papers have come, and prove to be copies of the *Tennessee Baptist*, the sermon being by Dr. E. Daniel, a Presbyterian minister, of Memphis, Tenn. We thank our unknown friend for his kindly interest in our welfare, but we are obliged to say that after reading this sermon we are not convinced that we are wrong. The little tract,

“Seven Reasons for Sunday-keeping Examined,” published at this office, takes up all the Scripture texts referred to in the article, and many more. There are, however, in the sermon, some good things, which serve to counterbalance the errors. We quote a few of them:-*SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.2*

“The Sabbath was not for the Mosaic or Jewish dispensation only, because the Sabbath law was not originally given to Moses; but the institution runs parallel with the history of the human race from the beginning of time. Proof of this proposition is found in the Old Testament, of course. At the end of the week of creation, God bless the seventh day and sanctified it. Marriage and the Sabbath are the two divinely ordained institutions which we can trace backward to Eden..... At the gathering of manna we read, ‘To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord. Bake that ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seeth, and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning? And Moses said, ‘Eat that to-day; for to-day is a Sabbath to the Lord. They shall be gathered it, but on the seventh, which is the Sabbath, there shall be none.’ Let it be remembered that this gathering of the manna here referred to was before the Israelites had come to Mount Sinai, and consequently before the typical law was given. How, then, can the Sabbath be of merely a positive and ceremonial nature, to be abrogated as a part of the ceremonial law, when we find its origin in Eden, traces of its observance through all the patriarchal dispensations, and indisputable evidence of its existence before the Israelites had ever received their ceremonial law? Is not the conclusion irresistible, that it was given originally to the whole race in Eden, and as it did not begin with the Sinaitic positive enactments, so it did not end with them at the coming of Christ?”*SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.3*

That is good, and now besides that we want to place one more quotation from the same sermon:-*SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.4*

“The Sabbath, in its essence, as already defined, is not a part of the ceremonial law, because it is found in the heart of the moral law. It is one of the ten commandments. It belongs to the great decalogue. Whoever may sweep away one of those grand moral precepts, binding all men, as men, Jew or Gentile alike, may sweep away

them all. But these words are written on the rock, and while time endures, they shall abide.”*SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.5*

The reader may ask, If the Dr. believes that which he has written, as quoted above, how can he agree for first-day observance? We will let him speak:-*SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.6*

“The substance of the Sabbath may be defined as this: The setting apart of one day in seven for purposes of rest and of religious worship. This is substantially all that is to be included as essential in a definition of the Sabbath. All else concerning it, as, for example, which day is to be observed, is a matter of positive enactments, and maybe changed, and has been changed.”*SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.7*

Here we disagree with him, no more so than he does with himself. He has said above that the Sabbath originated in Eden, together with marriage. In the record of creation what do we read? That God blessed the Sabbath institution? Not at all, “And God blessed *the seventh day*, and sanctified it.” *Genesis 2:3*. It was the day that was sanctified and blest.*SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.8*

Again we come to the gathering of the manna. The Doctor says that this was before the typical, ceremonial law was given. Very good. Now what does Moses say? “*To-morrow* is the rest of the holy Sabbath;” “on the seventh, which is the Sabbath, there shall be none.” Here we find that the day is the proper thing; yet it is claimed that the matter of which day is to be observed is ceremonial. We submit to the intelligent reader that if the typical law was not yet given, then there can be nothing typical about the day.*SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.9*

Once more; it is said that the Sabbath cannot be done away, like ceremonial ordinances, because is a part of the Decalogue,-enshrined in the heart of the moral law. We agree. Now let us read a portion of the commandment. “Remember the Sabbath-day [literally, the day of the Sabbath], to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but *the seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; IN IT thou shalt not do any work.” Here we find the day of the Sabbath clearly specified in the moral law. If the Sabbath is not ceremonial, but as enduring as the rock, because it is found

in the heart of the moral law, then the day of the Sabbath must be unchangeable, because that is found there also. Nay, more; if the keeping of a definite day be not necessary to the observance of the true Sabbath,-if that part of the commandment is ceremonial, and has been changed,-then we have no moral precept for Sabbath observance at all; for that being taken out, nothing is left. Will our friends please try to read the fourth commandment, leaving out that part which refers to a definite day? They would have to omit the first clause, for that says, "Remember *the* Sabbath day." The next clause would likewise have to be omitted, for the words, "six days shalt thou labor," are simply introductory to the definite statement that "*the seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." The next two words, "*in it*," clearly show that something definite has been mentioned; they must therefore be dropped. The whole of the latter part of the commandment is simply historical and explanatory, telling why God gave such a precepts. Leaving out, then, all of the commandment which enjoins the observance of a specified day, we have this much left: "Thou shalt not do any work." This would be indefinite enough for anybody. *SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.10*

Let us try this "indefinite" argument on the first commandment. The Lord says: "Thou shall have no other gods before me." Why may we not say: "Man is a worshiping being; he must have some object of adoration. This commandment recognizes that fact, in providing a deity. The act of reverential worship is all that is essential; all else, as, for example, the specific object to be worshiped, is a matter of positive enactments, and maybe changed." This reasoning is exactly parallel to that which we so often hear concerning the fourth commandment; yet the man who should act upon it would be called a heathen. Now will someone tell us the exact difference between ignoring the Creator entirely by setting up some god in his stead, and refusing obedience to plainly worded commandments, and especially that one of all the rest by which we recognize his creative power? The Saviour says, "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" Let everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord remember that Christ and the Father are one, and then consider that question as addressed directly to him. It will do to meditate upon. *SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.11*

E. J. W. *SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.12*

E. J. Waggoner

Mr. Savage, a Unitarian minister of Boston, preached a sermon a short time ago on “Immortality from the Stand-point of the Modern World,” in which he took occasion to speak of Spiritualism as follows:-*SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.13*

“There is nothing in it out of accord with the faith of those who already believe in continued existence. That our friends, if they still live and love us, should want us to know it, is only what we should expect.”*SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.14*

That this statement is true, we do not see how anybody can deny. And this is why we do not regard it as a matter of indifference how we believe concerning the state of the dead. We say that no one who believes that man is conscious in death-that his thoughts instead of perishing with his breath goes forth (*Psalm 146:4*), are more clear and active than ever, has any warrant whatever that he will not become a Spiritualist. Let us see. Spiritualism, pure and simple, is a belief that the spirits of the departed may communicate with their living friends, and may even appear to them. The mass of mankind believe that the essential part of man never dies, but that what is called death simply releases it from its prison house. They believe that it is in Heaven, and conscious of what is passing in this world. Indeed, we have heard more than one “orthodox,” minister preach that the spirits of our departed friends hover around us and protect and comfort us by their influence.*SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.15*

Now we ask, What is lacking to make such ones real Spiritualists? Nothing, but to see and converse with one bearing every feature of a departed friend, having the same tone of voice, and who can recall incidents known only to that dead friend. This has been done to a certain extent, and will be done on a vastly more extended scale.*SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.16*

“But how would you account for such a thing?” We read that Satan is able to transform himself into an angel of light, and this being so, it does not surprise us to hear of his personating a human being.

The Bible warns us against wonders that will deceive, if it were possible, the very elect, pointing out that which we have said, that a large portion of the world is in danger of being drawn into Spiritualism. The “elect” will not be deceived simply because they are grounded on Bible truth. So long as a man takes the Bible as it reads on the subject of the state of the dead, he cannot become a Spiritualist. When he holds to the popular theory, he has no safeguard against that terrible delusion. E. J. W. *SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.17*

“A Want Not Gratified” The Signs of the Times, 10, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

In an article in the *Christian at Work*, on “Baptism and the ‘Teaching,’” by Rev. F. Oxnard, we find the following:- *SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.18*

“We are perfectly willing to concede that there is no authority in the New Testament for infant baptism. We would like to bring immersionists to admit that there is no authority for the exclusive use of immersion in baptism. We suggest, therefore, that to insist that the word used in the Septuagint for immerse must always be thus used in a Christian ordinance, is open to very reasonable and grave objections, and is not in accordance with the ultimate authority, the New Testament. To insist that a word from classic Greek, used to express a non-sacred act, and similar words in the New Testament, used to express a sacred act, have always the same meaning, is to allow authors who lived hundreds of years before the Christian era to settle the mode of baptism.” *SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.19*

We admire the frankness of the author, as manifested in the above quotation. That the New Testament contains no authority for infant baptism there can be no doubt. Few theologians claim that it does. We have no doubt, moreover, that he, in common with many others, “would like to bring immersionists to admit that there is no authority for the exclusive use of immersion for baptism; but we can assure him that he can never do it unless he brings to bear some more weighty argument than that contained in his “suggestion.” He claims

that to insist that words from classic Greek must have the same meaning when used in the New Testament, is to allow heathen authors to settle the mode of baptism. By this, the reader will clearly see that it is admitted that if we should give them the same signification, immersion would be a settled fact. That is the words as used by classical authors, signifying immersion. *SITI June 26, 1884, page 393.20*

Now is it true that if they are used in the New Testament in the same sense, those authors have determined the meaning of the Christian ordinance? By no means. Christ determined that himself. How? By using in the Christian commission, a term which was in common use, and universally understood to mean immersion. He determined what the ceremony should be, and then described it in language which his hearers could understand. It was for this reason that he was not obliged to make a lengthy explanation as to what he meant by baptism; the name carried the idea. If he had coined a new word to express the act, or if he had used the same word, with a different meaning from that which it ordinarily had, it would have been necessary to define it, so that his followers might not be misled; but this he did not do. Therefore we must insist that the word in the New Testament has the same meaning that it does anywhere else. And there is no more reason for saying that this allows authors who lived hundred of years before the Christian era to settle the mode of baptism, than there is for saying that they settle the mode of celebrating Christ's sacrifice, because Christ, in instituting the Lord's Supper, used the same words for eating and drinking that had been used by them to denote these acts. E. J. W. *SITI June 26, 1884, page 394.1*

July 3, 1884

"2 Samuel 7:1-16" *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 26.

E. J. Waggoner

NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL LESSON.

JULY 20 - 2 Samuel 7:1-16.

"And it came to pass, when the king sat in his house, and the Lord had given him rest round about from all his enemies." *Verse 1*. At what time this was it is impossible to determine; probably not long after the events recorded in the preceding chapter. "That the king said unto Nathan the prophet, See now, I dwell in an house of cedar, but the ark of God dwelleth within curtains." *Verse 2*. This is the first mention of Nathan the prophet, who seems to have been David's constant adviser. He must have been considerably younger than David, for we read (*1 Chronicles 29:29*) that he wrote a history of the acts of David, and in *2 Chronicles 9:29* that he did the same for Solomon's reign. It is not certain, however, from this latter passage, that he outlived Solomon, for it may be that the writings of the two writers referred to are supplementary. That he was a true prophet is evident from the plain rebuke which he administered to David, as recorded in the twelfth chapter. *SITI July 3, 1884, page 406.1*

It may not be amiss to notice, in passing, the statements in *1 Chronicles 29:2* and *2 Chronicles 9:29*. None of these records by Nathan, Samuel, and Gad, Ahijah, and Iddo, are now extant. Nothing more is known of them than the brief mention in the above verses. Yet there is not the slightest doubt but that they were just as much inspired as were any of the records that we have. Why they were allowed to be lost, we cannot tell, nor does it concern us. The simple fact is that much has been written by inspiration that has not been given to us. In *Jeremiah 36* we have an instance of a message directly from the Lord, which was not preserved for us. Of course these things were not of especial importance to us, else they would have been preserved. God has given us, in his word as committed to us, everything that is necessary to enable us to do his will; until we have put in practice all that we have received, it ill

becomes us to find fault with him for not giving us more of the same kind of instruction. *SITI July 3, 1884, page 406.2*

“And Nathan said to the king, Go, do all that is in thine heart; for the Lord is with thee.” *Verse 3*. Nathan was a true prophet, and one who was intrusted with important messages from the Lord; yet on this occasion he gave advice that was directly contrary to the mind of the Lord. This does not show any evil intention on his part, but simply that prophets were not inspired at all times. David’s plan was a laudable one, and reasoning from a human standpoint no objections to it could be seen. But Nathan did not know the mind of the Lord on this subject. If there was any blame attaching to him; it was simply in giving his own opinion before asking counsel of the Lord. *SITI July 3, 1884, page 406.3*

At all events we read of no rebuke administered; but that very night “the word of the Lord came to Nathan, saying, Go and tell my servant David, thus saith the Lord, Shalt thou build meet an house for me to dwell in?” The words, “Shalt thou build me an house?” are equivalent to “Thou shalt not build me an house.” Thus in *Psalms 95:10*, margin, we have the literal rendering “If they shall enter into my rest,” meaning, “they shall not enter into my rest.” *SITI July 3, 1884, page 406.4*

From *1 Chronicles 22:5-10*, it is evident that much more was told to David than is here recorded. David there tells Solomon that the reason why he himself was not allowed to build a house of the Lord was that he had shed blood abundantly, and made great wars. From the further statement that Solomon, to whom would be intrusted the work of building the temple, would be a man of peace, and that there should be rest and quietness in Israel all his days, we may suppose that it was not simply the wars that David had made, but also those which he was yet to make, that made it improper for him to build the Lord’s house. Besides the fact that David had shed much blood, the fact that the kingdom was not yet fully established, was an objection, because he would be liable to interruption in the work by enemies. To him it was given to conquer the enemies of Israel, and settle the affairs of the kingdom on a solid basis, so that his successor might prosecute the work undisturbed. *SITI July 3, 1884, page 406.1*

The readiness with which the prophet recalled his first advice, at the command of the Lord, is worthy of note. He did not let a false pride keep him from telling the Lord's message, even though he was compelled to contradict his previous advice. As we look at the case, we can readily see how much better it was for Nathan to do so than to the demur; for in the latter case he would suffer the additional qualification of having his counsel contradicted by some other prophet, and he himself perhaps degraded from his office. Yet we are not always able to reason so clearly in our own cases. We should ever be thankful to God when he gives us an opportunity to correct our own mistakes, and should esteem it one of his greatest blessings that he points them out to us. E. J. W.*SITI July 3, 1884, page 406.2*

“Condemned and Justified” The Signs of the Times, 10, 26.

E. J. Waggoner

In the two preceeding articles on the law we have considered it simply in the light of Christ's declaration to the young man: “If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.” No one who contemplates the breadth of the law, and believes the inspired statement that it is perfect-the righteousness of God-can feel disposed to deny the statement of the wise man, that to fear God and keep his commandments is the whole duty of man. Obedience to a perfect law must produce a perfect character, and perfection is all that can be required of anybody.*SITI July 3, 1884, page 408.1*

But while we have been making these statements upon the authority of the Bible, some reader has doubtless called to mind the fact that Paul says that “by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified;” and he wants this harmonized with what has been said; or, possibly, he may think that it entirely overthrows our argument. We will examine it. The passage in full reads thus: “Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin.” *Romans 3:20.SITI July 3, 1884, page 408.2*

To understand this verse we must take it in its connection. But first, to the verse itself. Why can no flesh be justified in the sight of God

by the deeds of the law? The last clause of the verse gives the answer: "For by the law is the knowledge of sin." Well, why does the fact that the law gives the knowledge of sin make it impossible for any one to be justified by it? Read from the ninth verse onward, and you will see. Paul says: "We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." This he has done in the first and second chapters. "As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." *Romans 3:10-12*. After particularizing somewhat on this point, the apostle says: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." *Verse 19*. Then follows the conclusion, "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." *SITI July 3, 1884, page 408.3*

Now we can see the force of Paul's conclusion. Since the law gives us the knowledge of sin, by pointing it out, it condemns the whole world, for there is no man that has not sinned; all the world are guilty before God. And this is a sufficient reason why no one can be justified by the law. The law that justifies a criminal is a bad law; but the law of God is "holy, and just, and good;" it will not justify a sinner. *SITI July 3, 1884, page 409.1*

Let us illustrate this by a familiar example. Here is a man who has been taken in the act of robbing a store. He is brought into court for trial. Now will he stand up before the judge, and declare that he wants no counsel; that all he desires is simple justice, and then demand that the law be read, and declare his willingness to rest his case upon that alone? Certainly not, unless he desires to live in prison. He knows that the law does not justify any man in committing robbery; and he will therefore seek in every way possible to evade it. But there is no possibility of evading the law of God, and consequently all the world stands condemned. No one can fail to see that if the law justified sinners, then sin would cease to be sin; theft, murder, and adultery would be legal acts, and anarchy would prevail and be confirmed throughout the land. *SITI July 3, 1884, page 409.2*

If, however, an innocent man is accused of a crime, he may with all confidence appeal to the law. He does not wish to have anybody turn aside the law from its true meaning. He is anxious that his acts be compared with the plain reading of the law. And when that law is read, it justifies him, because he has done nothing but what it commends. By these two examples we see the working of a good law: it condemns the guilty, and justifies the one who has scrupulously obeyed its requirements. That this is the case with the law of God is seen by our Saviour's words: "For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God." *John 3:20, 21. SITI July 3, 1884, page 409.3*

It is plain that under no circumstances can a good law justify crime. The man may say, "This is the first time I ever violated the law." But the judge would reply, "You ought not to have violated it this time; perfect obedience is what the law requires." Or if he professes his determination to keep the law strictly forever afterward, that will not justify his sin, for he never can do more than his duty, and thus make up for past neglect. Whichever way he turns, the law stands in his way condemning him. Now shall we say that because the law thus condemns sin it is unworthy of respect, and ought to be abolished? By no means; no one but a confirmed reprobate would desire such a thing. The fact that it condemns the sinner shows it to be a good law, and lovers of the right will rejoice to see it maintained. *SITI July 3, 1884, page 409.4*

The position, then, thus far, is this: To keep the commandments is the whole duty of man; it is only by keeping them that we can have eternal life. But no man has kept them, neither can any man show a perfect record in this respect. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." *Romans 3:23*. How, then, it may well be asked, can any one be saved? How can we become justified? The answer comes: "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness: that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." *Romans 3:24-*

Christ was sinless; the law was in his heart. As the Son of God his life was worth more than those of all created beings, whether in Heaven or on earth. He saw the hopeless condition of the world, and came "to seek and to save that which was lost." *Luke 19:10*. To do this he took upon himself our nature, *Hebrews 2:16, 17*; and on him was laid "the iniquity of us all." *Isaiah 53:6*. In order to save us, he had to come where we were, or, in other words, he had to take the position of a lost sinner. Thus the apostle says: "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin." *2 Corinthians 5:21*. It was this fact that caused him such anguish in the garden. He felt that the sins upon him were shutting him away from God. It was this that caused him, when hanging on the cross, to utter that cry of bitter agony, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" It was not physical pain that crushed the life out of the Saviour of the world, but the load of sin which he bore. "The wages of sin is death." *Romans 6:23*. Sin will cause the death of every one who is not freed from it, for "sin when it is finished, bringeth forth death." *James 1:15*. And because Christ was "numbered with the transgressors," he suffered the penalty of transgression. *SITI July 3, 1884, page 409.6*

But the suffering of Christ was not on his own account. He did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth." *1 Peter 2:22*. He was one who could safely appeal to the law to justify him, for he had never violated it. The law had nothing against him. "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities." *Isaiah 53:5*. He alone has done more than his duty-more than was required of him; consequently he has merit to impart to others. This grace is freely given to all who believe in him. Thus: Our past life has been nothing but sin, for whatever good we may have thought to do, it was far from perfect. But we believe implicitly in Christ, and have faith in the efficacy of his sacrifice; and because of this simple faith, Christ will take our load of sins upon himself, and we will be accounted as though we had never committed them. He can take them without fear of any evil consequences to himself, because he has already suffered the extreme penalty of the law for them. And since our sins are taken from us, we are as though we had never broken the law, and therefore it can have nothing against us-it

cannot condemn us. So we stand before the court justified. Justified by what? By our works? No; justified by faith in Christ. Our works condemned us; Christ has justified us. And so Paul's conclusion is true, that "a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law."

Romans 3:28.SITI July 3, 1884, page 409.7

We now see that Paul does not contradict himself when he says (*Romans 2:13*), "For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified," and when he says (*Romans 3:20*), that "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified." Both are true. The doers of the law are always justified, as we have before shown, and the only reason why there is no one who is justified by the law is because there is no one who has done all the law.*SITI July 3, 1884, page 409.8*

In this article we have given only a brief outline of the way by which the sinner is justified. In subsequent articles we shall consider his relation to the law after he is justified, and also how, although no one is justified by the law, our Saviour's words apply with equal force to all, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." E. J. W.*SITI July 3, 1884, page 409.9*

"The Promise of His Coming" The Signs of the Times, 10, 26.

E. J. Waggoner

That there was once upon this earth a man called Jesus of Nazareth, scarcely anyone will now deny. Whatever conflicting views different ones may hold concerning his nature and office, all agree on this one fact. That he was taken, "and by wicked hands crucified and slain," is quite generally conceded. All, however, are not aware that the admission of these facts is virtually an admission of the inspiration of the Bible, but so it is. Those very things, which no human wisdom could foresee, were recorded by holy prophets hundreds of years before they occurred. This fact shows that those prophets were inspired, or, as Peter declares, they "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 *Peter 1:21.SITI July 3, 1884, page 409.10*

But this much being true, we must admit further that that which they

wrote of the mission of Jesus was also true. Paul sums it up in brief when he says that “to him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.” *Acts 10:43*. Christ is, then, as all Christians agree, the “only begotten Son of God;” he is “the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world;” he is the divine Word that, having been with God in the beginning, was made flesh and dwelt upon the earth. *John 1*. The incidents of his life, his subjection to his parents, his baptism, his temptation in the wilderness, his wonderful teachings, his marvelous miracles showing at once his tenderness and his power, his betrayal and crucifixion, and finally his triumphant resurrection and ascension to Heaven,-these are familiar to hundreds of thousands. *SITI July 3, 1884, page 409.11*

Aside from his wonderful sacrifice, which demands the unending love of all creatures, the character of Jesus as a man was most lovable. His disciples who had been with him night and day for more than three years, had learned to love him devotedly, both for what he was and what he promised them. On him all their hopes centered. Their feelings were well expressed by Peter, who, when they were asked if they would leave Jesus, said, “Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life.” We can imagine, then, to some extent, their grief when Jesus said to them: “Little children, yet a little while I am with you. Ye shall seek me; and as I said unto the Jews, Whither I go, ye cannot come; so now I say to you.” *John 13:33*. It was the blasting of all their hopes; their hearts were filled with anguish. Jesus, whom they loved, was to go away, and even though they should lay down their lives for him, he would not take them along. *SITI July 3, 1884, page 409.12*

But the compassionate Saviour would not leave his children in torturing suspense. Noticing their despondent looks, he said: “Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father’s house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.” *John 14:1-3. SITI July 3, 1884, page 409.13*

“Ye believe in God, believe also in me.” What can these words

mean, but that the words which he was about to utter were the words of God himself, true and unchangeable? Whatever this promise means, then, it will as surely be fulfilled as that God is a God of truth. We can rely upon it implicitly. *SITI July 3, 1884, page 409.14*

And now as to the meaning of the promise. How could it be made more clear? The gist of it is contained in these simple words: "I will come again." He was here then, a real being. The word "again," meaning "once more," implies a repetition of the same thing. That is, that he would come in the same form in which he then was,-glorified, of course, as we shall see,-but a real, tangible being,-Jesus of Nazareth. There is a great deal contained in the three verses which we have quoted, but at present we are concerned only with the simple fact that Christ has pledged his word to come again. *SITI July 3, 1884, page 409.15*

The time which Jesus spent on this earth, from his birth in Bethlehem until his ascension from the Mount of Olives, is known as the first advent, or coming of Christ. There is no question but that he had been upon the earth many times before, but that was his first appearance in connection with the great plan of salvation. And so, although he has since been on earth continuously, by his representative, the Holy Spirit, his second coming must be limited to that one mentioned in the promise, "I will come *again*." This promise cannot be fulfilled by anything except by his personal presence in glory. It will be his second coming in connection with the great plan of salvation-this time to complete the work by taking his people to himself. *SITI July 3, 1884, page 410.1*

That we are not mistaken in saying that Christ in comforting his disciples, gave promise of a second coming, is proved by the words of Paul, in *Hebrews 9:27, 28*: "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the Judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation." This places the matter beyond dispute. *SITI July 3, 1884, page 410.2*

This text also settles another much mooted question, that of a future probation. "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this

the Judgment.” How long after death the Judgment takes place must be determined by other texts. The general truth is stated that men die but once, and that after that their future fate is determined by the Judgment. “So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many.” That is, since men have but one life,-one probation,-which ends with their death, so Christ was only once offered. His offering had reference only to men in this present life. If man was to have two or more probations, then it would be necessary for two or more offerings to be made in his behalf; but there was only one offering. At his advent, Christ was offered “to bear the sins of many.” The Lord “laid on him the iniquity of us all.” *Isaiah 53:6*. “In his own body” he bore our sins on the tree. *1 Peter 2:24*. In order to save us from sin, he was made to be sin (*2 Corinthians 5:21*); the innocent One was counted as guilty in order that the guilty might be accounted innocent. The benefits of this sacrifice are now free to all who will accept it, while Jesus is pleading its merits before the Father. But when he comes “the second time,” he will be “without sin;” he will then no longer act as substitute for sinners; no longer will he assume any responsibility in their behalf. The sins of the righteous will have been blotted out, and those of the impenitent rolled back upon their own heads. There can then be no more probation for them unless Christ should again take upon himself their sins and make another sacrifice; for there is no salvation in any other. *Acts 4:12*. And since Christ makes but one offering, it follows that their sins remain upon them, to sink them into perdition.*SITI July 3, 1884, page 410.3*

In the texts already quoted, there is sufficient proof that the promised coming is not at the death of the saints, neither the conversion of sinners. He appears “to them that look for him;” to those who “love his appearing.” And this coming is not death, for it is only the “second” coming; if death were that coming, then there would be many millions of comings, for not an instant of time passes in which men do not die. He said that he would come “again;” now we submit that this can with no propriety be applied to death, unless his first coming was death, and they were all dead when he was speaking for “again” signifies repetition.*SITI July 3, 1884, page 410.4*

But we have an inspired comment on this point in the last chapter of

John. Christ had just signified to Peter by what death he should glorify God, when that disciple, turning about, saw John following, and asked, "What shall this man do?" "Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou me." *Verse 22*. Now if the coming of Christ is at the death of his saints, these words of Christ are equivalent to this: "If I will that he live until he dies, what is that to thee?" But such a substitution makes utter nonsense of the passage. Then when Christ spoke of his coming, he had no reference whatever to death. This will be still more evident as we consider texts that describe the manner of his coming. E. J. W. *SITI July 3, 1884, page 410.5*

July 17, 1884

“The Sabbath-School” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—JULY 16

1. On what occasion did Christ deliver the discourse recorded in the fourteenth chapter of John? *SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.1*
2. What had Jesus said that caused the disciples sorrow? *John 13:33.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.2*
3. Where was he going? *John 13:1.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.3*
4. Was he going to the Father immediately? *SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.4*
5. With what words did he comfort his troubled disciples? *John 14:1-3.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.5*
6. What idea is conveyed by the use of the word “again”? *SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.6*
7. What testimony does an inspired apostle bear on this point? *Hebrews 9:27, 28.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.7*
8. For what purpose does Christ appeared unto them that look for him? *SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.8*
9. In what different ways will his coming affect the righteous and the wicked? *Isaiah 66:5.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.9*
10. What did Christ’s sake he would do for his disciples at his second coming? *John 14:3.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.10*
11. Then since he comes only the “second time,” what must we conclude? *SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.11*
12. When, after Christ’s resurrection, Peter asked what John’s work

would be, what did Jesus reply? *John 21:20-22.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.12*

13. What saying immediately went abroad? *Verse 23.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.13*

14. Why did they think he would not die?*SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.14*

15. Does the inspired writer made a distinction between death and the coming of Christ? *John 21:23.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.15*

16. Can you find in Christ's promise to his disciples, proof that his coming does not mean the conversion of sinners?*SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.16*

17. Will Christ come to earth in person? *1 Thessalonians 4:16.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.17*

18. To what will the manner of his coming be similar? *Acts 1:10, 11.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.18*

19. How was he seemed to go into heaven? *Acts 1:9.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.19*

20. Is the one who is coming the same one who was crucified and buried here on earth? *Ephesians 4:8-10.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.20*

21. As Christ's went up, what received him? *Acts 1:9.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.21*

22. With what will he come? *Revelation 1:7.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.22*

23. How many will see him when he returns?*SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.23*

24. Is it probable that before Christ comes any one will teach that he has actually come in a secret manner? *Matthew 24:26.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.24*

25. Should we believe such teaching? *SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.25*

26. How can we prove it to be false? *Matthew 26:27.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.26*

27. Who will attend the Saviour when he returns? *Matthew 25:31.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.27*

28. What part will the angels have to act? *Matthew 24:31.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.28*

LESSON FOR AUGUST 2

1. What doctrine occupies a prominent place in the preaching of the apostle? *2 Peter 1:16.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.29*

2. When had they been eye-witnesses of the glory of Christ's second coming? *Verses 17, 18.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.30*

3. To what occasion does Peter refer? *Matthew 17:1-5.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.31*

4. Did they have any strong evidence to present than that of their own senses? *2 Peter 1:19.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.32*

5. How early was Christ's second coming a subject of prophecy? *Jude 14.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.33*

6. How long after the creation did Enoch live? *SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.34*

7. How long before the birth of Christ? *SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.35*

8. Who are the "saints" referred to in Enoch's prophecy? *Jude 14 (Revised Version); Matthew 25:31.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.36*

9. What other patriarch of ancient times prophesied of the Lord second coming? *Job 19:25-27.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.37*

10. What testimony did David bear on this subject? *Psalm 50:3-5; 96:11-13.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.38*
11. For what purpose did he say the Lord would come? *Psalm 50:5.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.39*
12. With what words of Christ is this agreed? *John 14:3.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.40*
13. What did the apostle John say at the thought of Christ in coming? *Revelation 22:20.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.41*
14. Why did he say this?*SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.42*
15. In the day of the Lord's coming what will be said? *Isaiah 25:9.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.43*
16. Why will the Lord saved these persons?*SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.44*
18. Who are the ones that will be rewarded when the Lord comes? *2 Timothy 4:8.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.45*
19. If we do not love to hear of or think about the Lord's coming, of what may we be assured?*SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.46*
20. Would we not naturally expect some revelation to be made concerning the time of so important and event? *Amos 3:7.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.47*
21. What does Paul say to the brethren? *1 Thessalonians 5:1.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.48*
22. Of what "times and seasons" is he speaking? *1 Thessalonians 4:15-17.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.49*
23. If there was no need for Paul to write concerning the time, what must we conclude?*SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.50*
24. Why are the brethren not ignorant of the time? *1 Thessalonians 5:4, 5.SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.51*

25. What makes them children of the light? *Psalms 119:105. SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.52*

26. Upon whom will the day of the Lord, as a thief? *1 Thessalonians 4:2, 3; Luke 21:35. SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.53*

27. What will cause men to be blind to the near coming of Christ? *Luke 21:34, 35. SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.54*

28. Can the people of God be called “dwellers” upon this earth? *Hebrews 11:13; 1 Peter 2:11. SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.55*

29. Where is there home? *Hebrews 11:16; Philippians 3:20 (Revised Version). SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.56*

The words of Christ in *John 14:1-3* are very significant when we consider them carefully, in the light of his previous words. The last Passover supper, Jesus had told his disciples once more that he was about to leave them. He had previously told the unbelieving Jews that they would die in their sins, and that whither he went they could not come (*John 8:21*). And now to his loved disciples he said: “As I said to the Jews, whither I go ye cannot come; so now I say to you.” *John 13:30*. Peter, ever zealous, declared himself ready to die for his Master, but even that would not give him the desired privilege of being with the one whom he loved. In this time of sadness and gloom the Saviour spoke the comforting words found in *John 14:1-3* and onward. He assured them that the separation would not be final, but that he would return to take them to the mansions prepared for them. *SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.57*

What the Saviour promised must be considered in the light of what the disciples wanted. They desired his personal presence with them. Now if Jesus promised them something else, his words could contain no comfort for them. We would therefore expect him to promise a literal return for them. And this is just what he did. “I will come again.” This can mean nothing but that he would once more be as really present with them as he was then. *SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.58*

How can we know that Christ is not already come? and if he has not come, how can we tell when that event takes place? These

questions have been answered in advance. When he comes it is to execute judgment upon all that are ungodly (*Jude 15*); his people will be taken to be with him forever (*1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17*); but they are yet separated from him. Many will teach that Christ is come, but we need not be deceived. "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be." *Matthew 24:27*. He will come in the same manner in which he ascended to heaven (*Acts 1:11*), a real, personal being, "the same Jesus," and "every I shall see him." *Revelation 1:7*. There will then be no need for one to tell another that the Lord is come, for none can be ignorant of the fact. *SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.59*

Why do we have some much to say about the coming of the Lord? Simply because we find so much about it in the Bible. There is no other subject which occupies so much space. Peter says (*2 Peter 1:16*) that the apostles had made known the power and the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, and that they had evidence of that which they declared. Besides their personal testimony, we have, as he says, the "more sure word of prophecy," which speaks with no uncertain sound on the subject of Christ's coming. Indeed that is the principal object for which they were given. They all point to the one event. Peter, after speaking in the third chapter of his second epistle with great positiveness concerning the coming of the Lord, says that Paul in his epistles speaks of these things (*verses 15, 16*); this statement we can easily verified by an examination of the writings of Paul. In them the coming of the Lord is spoken of familiarly as a thing well understood. *SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.60*

And why should it not be so? What more natural than that the event which is to be the consummation of all things should be often spoken of? Christ had comforted the hearts of his sorrowing disciples with the promise that he would come to receive them to himself. Now if they had never said anything about that promise, we would say that their love for their Lord, and their desire to be with him was not very ardent. We would measure their love for their Master by the earnestness of their longing for his return. They did love the Saviour with intense devotion, and consequently his return was their constant theme. Does any one say that they were too

sanguine, or that they were mistaken? Such a statement is nothing less than charging the Lord himself with deception, for they said nothing but what he had taught them. If they were mistaken in this, we have no warrant that they were not mistaken in everything, and in that case what becomes of our Bible? No, they were not deceived, and we can depend upon what the Holy Spirit has preserved for our instruction. *SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.61*

Only those who love his appearing will receive the crown when the Lord comes. *2 Timothy 4:8*. It is only to those who look for him that he appears unto salvation. The mere fact that we talk about the coming of the Lord does not prove that we love his appearing but it is certain that we do not love his appearing if we do not love to think and talk about it. If we love the Lord we shall certainly love his appearing. How may we know that we really love him, and are preparing for his coming? He says, "If ye love me keep my commandments." If we are walking in his footsteps, obeying his voice, we show our love for him. E. J. W. *SITI July 17, 1884, page 422.62*

"A New Creature in Christ" The Signs of the Times, 10, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

We have shown from the Scriptures that the whole duty of man is to keep the commandments, and that only by so doing can we gain eternal life. We have also found that the law, being perfect and holy, condemns the whole world, and that we can be freed from this condemnation only by faith in Christ. The law condemns; Christ has opened the way for pardon. When the sinner has acknowledged his guilt, and has accepted Christ as his Saviour, he can say, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." *Romans 5:1*. We now inquire, What is his relation to the law from this time on? and, Does this condition of things make any less true the statement that to fear God and keep his commandments is the whole duty of man? *SITI July 17, 1884, page 424.1*

In *2 Corinthians 5:17* Paul describes a man in this justified state: "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things

are passed away; behold all things are become new.” We have heard this text quoted to prove that a man in Christ has no more use for the law, that such old things as that are done away. The absurdity of such a claim is manifest on its very face; for if that supposition were true, it would amount to saying that the law is abolished only for Christians, but that it is in full force until a man becomes a Christian; and since Christians and sinners live side by side in this world, we would have the anomaly of the law being both abolished and in full force at the same time!*SITI July 17, 1884, page 424.2*

But the eighteenth verse tells what the new things are: “And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ.” If a man in Christ does all things that are of God, he certainly will not violate God’s law. The statement of what Christ did for us, proves this: “Who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.” *Verse 19*. The act of reconciliation implies that certain parties have been estranged from each other-have been enemies. So Paul, in *Romans 5:8-10*, shows that while we were sinners-transgressing the law-we were the enemies of God, and that we are reconciled by the death of his Son. The prophet Isaiah (*ch. 30:9*) shows very clearly in what rebellion against God consists, where he says that “this is a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the law of the Lord.” And Paul also states that the carnal mind is enmity against God, simply because “it is not subject to the law of God.” *Romans 8:7.SITI July 17, 1884, page 424.3*

Since, then, our enmity to God while we were sinners consisted simply in disobedience to his law, it must necessarily follow that when we are reconciled we will keep the law. Indeed, the very act of reconciliation implies submission on our part to the requirements of God. Paul goes on to say (*2 Corinthians 5:20*) that having received the commission from God, “we [that is, the ministers of Christ] are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ’s stead, be ye reconciled to God.”*SITI July 17, 1884, page 424.4*

This means simply that the work of the gospel is to persuade men to keep the law of God. The thing is stated in plain words by the apostle Peter, when he says, "The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away; but the word of God endureth forever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." *1 Peter 1:24, 25.SITI July 17, 1884, page 424.5*

The point, however, is established beyond all controversy by the closing words of *2 Corinthians 5*: "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." The turn which some give to the first part of this verse, viz., that Christ was made a sin-offering for us, robs the text of all its force. It is true that Christ was our sin-offering, but that is not what the apostle here states. God made Christ (the sinless one) to be sin for us. He was made in all things "like unto his brethren;" and that means not simply as to the outward, physical frame, but that he bore sin, just as we do. The sins that he bore were not his own, but ours. He "knew no sin," yet "the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." *Isaiah 53:6*. Although the sins that he bore were ours, they were counted as his own, and so caused his death. "He was wounded for our transgression, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed." *Isaiah 53:5.SITI July 17, 1884, page 424.6*

And why was this done? Why was the spotless Lamb of God made to be sin for us? Paul answers: "That we might be made the righteousness of God in him." What is the righteousness of God? We have already shown from *Isaiah 51:6, 7* that it is nothing else but the law of God. Then Paul's words mean that Christ was made to be sin for us in order that, in him, we might be conformed to the law of God. This, then, is what it is to be a new creature in Christ; it is to put away the old life of sin, and to become reconciled to God by keeping his law.*SITI July 17, 1884, page 424.7*

In the second chapter of Ephesians Paul briefly states the change from being dead in trespasses and sins to being quickened, and made to sit in heavenly places in Christ Jesus. This is done because God is rich in mercy. We read: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of

works, lest any man should boast.” *Verses 8, 9.* The term “saved” is sometimes used in an accommodated sense. We are really saved only when we are given the victory over death, and are made immortal in the kingdom of God. This salvation is brought to us “at the revelation of Jesus Christ.” *1 Peter 1:13.* But since this everlasting salvation is given only to those who overcome their sins (*Revelation 3:21*), we are said to be saved when we are freed from our past sins through the pardoning mercy of God. If we continue in this condition, we will receive our full salvation. In this place the word may be taken in both senses. “Not of works, lest any man should boast.” Simply a repetition of *Romans 3:28.* God was not under obligation to save us, and we could not atone for past sins, and thus earn salvation. Our salvation is wholly due to the infinite mercy of God through the merits of Christ and consequently we have nothing whereof to boast. Shall we conclude from this, then, that Christ does everything for us, that is, in our stead, and that we have no call to work for ourselves? Paul does not so teach. “For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.” *Ephesians 2:20.* By being “created in Christ Jesus,” we are made new creatures in Christ; and for what? That we might be able to perform good works, for that is what God from the beginning designed that we should do, and this is our whole duty. *SITI July 17, 1884, page 424.8*

And now we are able to understand fully Christ’s reply to the young ruler who asked the way of life. *Matthew 19:18-21.* While he said, “if thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments,” you will notice that he did not leave him with that. Christ well knew that the man, in spite of his self-righteousness was a sinner. By a simple test he showed that the young man was not only covetous, but that he did not love his neighbor as well as he did himself, and that he did not love God with all his heart. He was selfish, and loved himself and his property more than he did God and his neighbors; and so he was a violator of all the commandments, for he broke the two great precepts upon which they hang. (*Matthew 22:36-40.*) Christ well knew that the young man could not justify himself, nor even keep the commandments as they should be kept, in his own strength, and so he added the words, “Come, and follow me.” What for? That in Christ he might be a new creature; that, whereas by himself he

had utterly failed of fulfilling the righteousness of God, in Christ, he might attain to that; in short, that he might be enabled to keep the commandments.*SITI July 17, 1884, page 424.9*

And so it still remains a fact that to fear God and keep his commandments is the whole duty of man and Christ has simply come to our aid, to help us to do our duty. While he assumes the responsibility of the sins which the believer has committed in the past and thus sets him once more in the right way, justified before God, he tells him that “without me you can do nothing.” We are “created in Christ Jesus unto good works,” but it is only while we abide in him that we can bear any fruit. Without Christ our efforts to obey God are vain struggles; with the strength which he gives we can do all things, and at last stand “complete in him.” And this opens the way for us to understand how it is that Christ is the end of the law, which will next be considered. E. J. W.*SITI July 17, 1884, page 424.10*

“Manner of Christ’s Coming” The Signs of the Times, 10, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we gave two texts (*John 14:1-3; Hebrews 9:27, 28*) which contain a direct promise of Christ’s second coming. If the subject were mentioned nowhere else in the Bible, these two texts would be sufficient. They are unequivocal statements of a fact, and the promises of God are not yea and nay. From those texts we concluded that the second coming of Christ must be as real and literal as his first. We shall now produce positive testimony to that effect. We would first, however, remind the reader that every text that speaks of the manner or object of Christ’s coming, is additional proof of the fact that he will come again.*SITI July 17, 1884, page 425.1*

In his first letter to the Thessalonians, the apostle Paul warns the brethren against indulging in hopeless sorrow for their dead friends, as though they were lost. He assures them, “by the word of the Lord,” that those who live until the Lord comes will have no precedence over those who fall asleep in Jesus. We will not be with Christ any sooner than they are. And then he proceeds to tell how

this can be. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord." *1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17. SITI July 17, 1884, page 425.2*

We shall have occasion to use this text again, and we pass it for the present. Turning to the first chapter of Acts, we read the account of Christ's ascension. In his gospel, Luke had previously written, "And he led them out as far as to Bethany, and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven." *Luke 24:50, 51.* In Luke's second narrative we have this account: "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." *Acts 1:9-11. SITI July 17, 1884, page 425.3*

There is no mistaking these words. Christ was there in person. In bodily form, while in the act of blessing his disciples, he ascended to heaven. And the angels declared that "the same Jesus"- "the Lord himself," *1 Thessalonians 4:16*-should come in exactly the same manner as had left the earth. Now, as showing the perfect harmony of the Bible narrative, we quote right here the words of John: "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, Amen." *Revelation 1:7.* The one who claims that the coming of Christ is death, or conversion, or anything else than a literal return to earth, squarely contradicts these plain texts. *SITI July 17, 1884, page 425.4*

Our Saviour foresaw that before his return many would be engaged in this very work. In order to draw the attention of man away from the real advent of Christ, as described in the Bible, Satan and his angels will transform themselves, not merely into angels of light, but into the appearance of Christ himself, and will "show great signs

and wonders; insomuch that if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect.” *Matthew 24:24*. They will claim that Christ is already come, and will work miracles to support the claim. How, then, can we be sure that they are not the Christ; here is the sure guide: “Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth; behold, he is in the secret chambers; believe it not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.” *Matthew 24:26, 27*. The reason why it will be impossible to deceive the elect, is because they will remember and implicitly believe the plain declarations of the Bible. *SITI July 17, 1884, page 425.5*

These texts prove not only that the coming of the Lord is a literal event, but that it is yet future. Do you still say that it took place on the day of Pentecost? We answer that Paul’s words in *Hebrews 9:28* were written many years after that time. None of the apostles had written a line at that time, and, since the resurrection of Christ, had engaged in no public work whatever. Is it claimed that the destruction of Jerusalem answers to the coming of the Lord, we remind you that the book of Revelation was written more than a score of years after Jerusalem was conquered by Titus; and in that book, besides the description already quoted (*Revelation 1:7*), almost the closing words are these: “And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be.” *Revelation 22:12*. “He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly.” *Verse 20*. These forbid the application of the promise to any event before the close of the first century. *SITI July 17, 1884, page 425.6*

Again, no event has ever yet occurred comparable to the coming of the Lord as described in the Bible. Peter, in answer to those who, professing to be able to see no signs of such an event, derisively asked, “Where is the promise of his coming?” says: “But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up.” *2 Peter 3:10*. *SITI July 17, 1884, page 426.1*

The psalmist says: “Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very

tempestuous round about him. He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that he may judge his people. Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice." *Psalm 50:3-5.SITI July 17, 1884, page 426.2*

The heavens have not departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; not yet as the glorious appearing of the Son of man in those opening heavens dazzled every eye as does the vivid lightning flash. Not yet have "the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every free man, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb." *Revelation 6:15, 16.* The time is still future when the voice of the Archangel and the trump of God shall call the dead in Christ from their graves, and when the living righteous, with glad accord, shall unite in the exclamation: "Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us; this is the Lord; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation." *Isaiah 25:9.SITI July 17, 1884, page 426.3*

That they will not pass and leave saints and sinners alike unconscious of its arrival. The Lord comes, not as an intercessor, but as a king, "without sin." There is thenceforward no more mercy for sinners-they receive according to their deeds; no more trials for saints-he appears to them unto salvation. This being so, it is manifestly fool-hardy in any one to say, "We shall know more about it when it comes than we do now." Yes, we will; but those who put off their knowledge of it until it comes, will learn to their sorrow. While the signs that show that coming near are fulfilling all around us, let us search the Scriptures that we may be children of the light, and, having our lamps trimmed and burning, be able to hail our Lord with joy when he returns. E. J. W.*SITI July 17, 1884, page 426.4*

"Some Modern Criticism" The Signs of the Times, 10, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

The apostle Paul wrote that "whatsoever things were written

aforetime [referring to the Old Testament Scriptures] were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope.” *Romans 15:4*. It would seem that the modern expositor reads it, “Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our *criticism*.” And in his case the word “criticism” means to pull to pieces, and not simply to wait and judge. In the great struggle to make the Bible harmonize with “science,” the subject of miracles has of course been much discussed. Now it happens that “science” has no place in its domain for miracles, and it has therefore occurred as a necessary consequence of the intense desire that the Bible shall not be regarded as being behind the age, that its avowed friends have quite generally set themselves to work to explain all supposed miracles in accordance with “known natural laws.” The latest effort disposes of the miracle of the sun’s standing still at the command of Joshua in the following manner:-*SITI July 17, 1884, page 434.1*

“A writer in the *Church Quarterly Review* maintains that what the Israelitish leader prayed for was not that the sun and moon might ‘stand still,’ but that they might ‘be silent,’ that is to say, ‘ceased to shine’-*dom shemesh*, as the Hebrew text has it. A storm of hail-stones was the principal cause of the defeat of the allied kings. Joshua, finding that the storm and darkness by which it was accomplished did more toward the overthrow of the enemy than his own troops, naturally prayed that the darkness might continue until the utter ruin of the foe was accomplished. The formidable astronomical objections to the miracle are thus removed by a simple philological discovery, which the reader may accept or not, at his pleasure.”*SITI July 17, 1884, page 434.2*

We are glad that the *Christian at Work*, from which we clip the above, gives us the privilege of accepting it or not, as we choose. We choose to give such nonsense a wide berth. We are greatly surprised that that journal, and others which lay claim to great Biblical knowledge, should quote with approval a theory which is so directly contradictory to the plain Scripture narrative. It is simply a proof that there is a wide-spread desire to strip the Bible of everything which stands in the way of its acceptance by a self-sufficient, unbelieving world,-in other words to make the way of life so broad that all will find themselves in it without making any

effort.*SITI July 17, 1884, page 434.3*

How does this explanation agree with the Bible? Let us see. Our critic says that the sun was simply darkening during the day; the Bible says, “So the sons stood still in the midst of heaven and *hasted not to go down about a whole day.*” We have seen many stormy days when the sun did not shine, but the sun always set at the appointed time. In this instance the sun did not go down, according to Joshua’s command; but if darkness for were what he wished, he would with more propriety have prayed that the sun might hasten its going down, instead of that its course should be stayed.*SITI July 17, 1884, page 434.4*

Again, the sacred historian declares: “And there was no day like that before it or after it, that the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man.” *Joshua 10:14*. If the answer to Joshua’s prayer consisted simply in the Lord sending a storm and darkness, we cannot understand this statement, for there have been many stormy days since then; but we can well believe that never since that time has there been so extraordinary an occurrence as the sun’s standing still for a whole day. It will be clearly seen that if a critic had read the entire narrative carefully, his criticism could not have been made.*SITI July 17, 1884, page 434.5*

“But,” says one, “how do *you* explain that miracle?” We don’t explain it; it is entirely beyond our capacity, and that is why we call it a miracle. There are some wonderful things that we *can* account for, but we do not call them miracles. We believe in a God, and therefore we believe in miracles-things entirely beyond the comprehension of human minds. The desire to find an explanation for all recorded miracles and the Bible, arises from a growing unbelief that such things really occur; and to deny the occurrence of miracles is really the same as denying the existence of God.*SITI July 17, 1884, page 434.6*

Perhaps this last statement may not be self-evident to all; we think it can easily be made to appear. God is greater than man; if he were not, he would be simply a man, and therefore not an object of worship. But he is infinite. “Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty and the perfection?” *Job 11:7*. This

question can be answered only in the negative. God is incomprehensible. Then of course his acts must be above the comprehension of man. Paul had thought much on heavenly things, and had been admitted into close communion with the Lord, and he exclaimed, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his waist past finding out." *Romans 11:33*. This is only in keeping with what we should expect. Finite minds cannot grasp infinitely. Then of course there must be miracles. And when many things are recorded, all of which are beyond our comprehension, who shall say that some of these are possible and others impossible? Who will dare to limit the power of an infinite God?*SITI July 17, 1884, page 434.7*

"But," says another, do you believe that God violates laws of nature, in performing miracles? Again we reply, We do not know; it is impossible to tell. We are very certain that he has often done things that directly conflict with any laws known to man. But then there are many things that even scientific men do not know. So long as we cannot understand God, we cannot understand the laws of nature, for they are his laws. Things that seem impossible to us, may be in perfect harmony with laws of which we know nothing. When the Dutch ambassador told the king of Siam that in his country water sometimes assumed such a condition that man could walk upon it, the king said, "I often thought that you were untruthful, but now I know you lie. It is impossible for man to walk upon water." Doubtless the king's scientific men would have said the same thing, and *proved* it by science. It is contrary to the nature of a clock for the hands to move backward, and yet a man can move them backward. The child gazes with wonder upon the steam engine, and cannot comprehend how the engineer can start, stop, or back it at pleasure; but it would be foolishness in him to assert that those things cannot be done. Well, this universe is the great machine which God has made, and which he controls. Between the mind of man and that of the great Architect, there is no more comparison than there is between the ant beside the track, and the man who drives the engine. And so, instead of denying the existence of miracles, we are lost in wonder and admiration of the power that is as infinitely beyond us.*SITI July 17, 1884, page 434.8*

And now a few words by way of application. Some will say, "We did not need this article, for we believed in the miracles of the Bible just as they are recorded." We are glad of that. But would not such an article as the one from which we have quoted shake your faith? "No." Why not? Because it directly contradicts the Bible. "But do you profess to know more about the Bible than a learned D. D., who has spent a life-time in its study, and who understands the Hebrew and Greek? You reply, "I can understand the English language, and I know when a man is contradicting the plain statement of the Bible." Then you are willing to admit that "great men are not always wise," and that even learned men may be led by their prejudices into grievous and palpable errors? "Certainly." Well this is just what we wish to have you bear in mind. And now whenever you hear some wise men say that God did not bless and sanctify the seventh day, but only the Sabbath institution, and that he now requires men to observe the first day instead of the seventh, don't be overawed into acquiescence by the immensity of his learning, but simply ask him for his authority. "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." *Isaiah 8:20.* E. J. W. *SITI July 17, 1884, page 434.9*

"The Sabbath-School" The Signs of the Times, 10, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST.—AUG. 9

1. What did Jesus say to this disciples as they were at one time pointing out the splendor of the temple? *Matthew 24:1, 2.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.1*
2. What questions they ask him? *Verse 3.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.2*
3. Did he rebuke them for making such an inquiry? *Verse 4.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.3*
4. Why were they to be so careful? *Verse 5.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.4*

5. Did the Lord and courage his disciples to expect his coming immediately? *Verse 6.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.5*
6. What terrible things did he say must first come? *Verse 7.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.6*
7. With those calamities indicate that the end was at hand? *Verse 8.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.7*
8. What else did he say must be done before the end would come? *Verse 14.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.8*
9. When did he say that those which were in Judea should flee to the mountains? *Verses 15, 16, 10.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.9*
10. What is meant by the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place? *Luke 21:20, 21.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.10*
11. When they sought Jerusalem surrounded with armies, what were they to know? *Ib.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.11*
12. Then to what did Jesus have reference in *Matthew 24:15*? *SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.12*
13. What had Jesus, on a previous occasion, said should take place at the end of the world? *Matthew 13:40-43.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.13*
14. At the destruction of Jerusalem to the angels cast all that did even iniquity into a furnace of fire? *SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.14*
15. Rather righteous made to shine as the sun in the kingdom of God? *SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.15*
16. Then can it be that the destruction of Jerusalem was the “end” to which Christ and the apostles referred? *SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.16*
17. To what did he say his coming would be similar? *Matthew 24:27.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.17*
18. Following the destruction of Jerusalem, what did he say there

would be? *Verse 21.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.18*

19. How great would the tribulation be?*SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.19*

20. What would be the result, if those days were not shortened?
Verse 22.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.20

21. For whose sake were they to be shortened? *lb.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.21*

22. If some of the elect would be saved in consequence of the shortening of those days of trouble, who were they that were to suffer that great tribulation?*SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.22*

23. Who were meant by “the elect”? *Acts 10:35.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.23*

24. What were the people of God commanded to do when they saw that the destruction of Jerusalem was near? *Luke 21:20, 21.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.24*

25. If all the Christians left Jerusalem before it was destroyed, could any of them have suffered in the siege?*SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.25*

26. Then can the tribulation of *Matthew 24:21, 22* be limited to that at the destruction of Jerusalem?*SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.26*

27. Was a time of trouble for the saints of God foretold in prophecy?
Daniel 7:25.SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.27

In the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew two subjects are considered-the destruction of Jerusalem, and the coming of the Lord. Concerning these two events only one point is considered, namely, time. There was no question as to whether those things would occur, for Christ had already assured them of that fact; but the question is, “When shall these things be?” It is this question that our Saviour answers in the discourse that follows. Incidentally, it is true, he imparts additional information concerning those events; but the main point in the chapter is to settle the time of their

occurrence. *SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.28*

Although the discourse relates to time, no attempt is made to fix the exact date of either event. Concerning the destruction of Jerusalem he says (we quote the parallel passage in *Luke 21:20*): "And when ye shall see Jerusalem contest with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh." This is as definitely as that event is located. The disciples are informed as to the events that will show it to be imminent, so that they can escape before the ruin comes. So likewise concerning the coming of the Lord. After relating certain signs, to be considered in detail hereafter, he says: "So likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors." *Matthew 24:33. SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.29*

It is popularly supposed that if all men are not ultimately converted, the gospel will have proved to be a failure. This would indeed be the case if it were anywhere stated that the gospel was designed to accomplish the conversion of all men. The trouble is that men make the mistake of expecting more of the gospel than the Lord ever said it would do. He said (*Matthew 24:14*) that it should be preached in all the world for a *witness*. Now witness may testify *against* a man as well as for him. The work of a true witness is not to favor any one, but to tell the exact truth and let that justify or condemn according to circumstances. James said that God visited the Gentiles to take *out of them* a people for his name. *Acts 15:14*. God was perfectly willing and anxious that all should be converted, at the same time he knew that many would remain stubborn and rebellious. If all men are permitted to hear the gospel in its purity, then the gospel will have accomplished its work. It is a witness to all men; to some it will prove a savor of life unto life; to others, a savor of death unto death. *2 Corinthians 2:14-16. SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.30*

"This gospel of the kingdom." In these words the gospel in its entirety is brought to view. The Lord was speaking about his coming, and when he said, "this gospel of the kingdom," he evidently meant the gospel which proclaims his coming to set up his kingdom. And this is the gospel itself; for the gospel is the good news of salvation; it brings to view the plan by which condemned rebels may be saved from death, and converted into loyal subjects

of the kingdom of heaven. But, as we have already seen, the final salvation of man depends upon the coming of Christ. None are saved until the Lord comes for them. To leave the coming of the Lord out of the preaching of the gospel would be to deprive it of all its force. So we say that the preaching of the gospel includes the announcement that the Lord is coming. The gospel is not complete without this. And therefore it is not enough that all nations have heard of Christ; they must also hear of his second coming in glory to save his people, and must have an opportunity to learn of the special preparation necessary to fit them for the event. When this shall have been done, then the end will come, as stated in *Matthew 24:14*. *SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.31*

Whatever idea may have been in the minds of the disciples when they asked the question recorded in *Matthew 24:3*, it is certain that Jesus made a wide distinction between his coming and the destruction of Jerusalem. Christ had previously said (*Matthew 13:36-43*), that in the end of the world he would send forth his angels to gather up the wicked and cast them into a furnace of fire, and that the righteous should then shine forth as the sun. This did not occur at the destruction of Jerusalem. Again, we have learned (*1 Thessalonians 4:15-17*) that the Lord himself shall descend, and that the righteous dead shall be raised. This was not the case at the destruction of Jerusalem. More than all, in the Revelation, which was written more than twenty years after the destruction of Jerusalem, and in John's Gospel, which was written still later, the coming of the Lord is spoken of as an event then in the future. And, finally, Christians are taught, both by Christ and by his apostles, to look for the coming of the Lord as the consummation of all their hopes; they are taught that they cannot be with him unless he comes again. Now if Christ's coming is in the past, Christians at the present they have nothing to look forward to. But our faith is not in vain, for our King is yet to come with his reward. *SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.32*

"For there shall be tribulation." When? Following the destruction of Jerusalem. To whom was the trouble to come? Upon the people. This is proved by *verse 22*: "For the elect's sake those days shall be shortened." The elect are the beloved of the Lord, those who serve him. But if the elect were saved from utter extermination only by the

shortening of the trouble, then it follows that the trouble was upon the people of God. And this is proof that the destruction of Jerusalem is not referred to in the passage, for before that city was destroyed, the disciples, in accordance with the Lord's instruction in *Matthew 24:15, 16*, had fled. When the final siege came, there were none of the disciples of Christ in the city. The tribulation referred to in *verses 21, 22*, must therefore refer to something besides the destruction of Jerusalem. "It is a fact that the early Christians did suffer very much from pagan persecution; but these cannot be all the tribulations referred to, for the promise that certain days should be shortened, indicates that the Saviour had in mind a definite period, during the greater part of which his followers should suffer grievous persecution. This fact is plainly stated in Mark's account, where he says: "But in those days, after that tribulation." *Mark 13:24*. The question then arises, To what period of persecution did Christ refer? *SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.33*

In the book of Daniel we have two times of trouble brought to view. One is mentioned in *chap. 12:1*, but that trouble must be for the wicked, for God's people are to be delivered from it. In *Daniel 7:25*, however, we read of a certain power that "he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws." The term "wear out" is very forcible, indicating slow but sure extermination by torture. The time allotted to this work was "a time and times, and the dividing of time," a definite period. This, then, must be the tribulation to which the Saviour referred as coming upon his people,-a tribulation that failed to entirely "wear out" or exterminate its victims only because it was cut short. E. J. W. *SITI July 17, 1884, page 438.34*

July 24, 1884

“Object of Christ’s Coming” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 28.

E. J. Waggoner

We have now established two points beyond controversy. First, that Christ will come again (*John 14:1-3*; *Hebrews 9:28*); and second, that his second coming will be as literal as the first (*Acts 1:9-11*; *Revelation 1:7*), the only point of difference being that it will be more glorious (*Matthew 24:27*; *25:31*). We say that these points have been established beyond controversy, because we have read them directly from the Bible, in words so plain that a child could not misunderstand them. They need no interpretation to make them plainer.*SITI July 24, 1884, page 441.1*

But if the Lord is indeed coming again, it must be for some purpose; he must have some object in view. And if he was so particular to tell us of his coming, and to urge us to prepare for that great event, it must be that he has not left us in ignorance as to its object. We shall find that the Scriptures are very clear upon this point also.*SITI July 24, 1884, page 441.2*

The words of Christ himself demand our first attention. We have quoted the promise of Christ’s coming found in *John 14:1-3*. That promise also contains the reason: “If I go to prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; *that where I am there ye may be also.*” He is coming, then, to take all his followers to himself. Those who mourned at the thought of having him apart from them, will then once more enjoy his presence.*SITI July 24, 1884, page 441.3*

Besides this, there is something else. Paul comforted the Thessalonian brethren in their tribulation with the thought that God himself could give them rest, and this rest he said they would receive “when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, and flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.” *2 Thessalonians 1:7, 8*. With those two texts agree the words of Christ: “For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his

Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works." *Matthew 16:27*; and these: "And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me to give every man according as his work shall be." *Revelation 22:12*. *SITI July 24, 1884, page 441.4*

These texts show plainly enough the object of Christ's second coming. It is to take his people to himself, and to take vengeance on the wicked. This latter part we will pass by for the present, and consider the promise to the disciples. From the words of Christ we would naturally conclude that there is no other way for his people to be with him except by his coming. "I will come again, and receive you unto myself, *that* where I am, there ye may be also." The conjunction 'that' denotes purpose, and is equivalent to "in order that." When we read, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, *that* whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (*John 3:16*), we understand that belief in Christ is the only way by which we can avoid perishing. And so when we read the promise of Christ to his disciples, we understand that if Christ were not to come, his disciples could not be with him. Indeed, if it were otherwise, -if the disciples could be with Christ without his coming for them, -what force or comfort would there be in his promise? For the only words of comfort that he had for them were that he would come to take them to himself. Moreover, we cannot imagine Jesus making an unnecessary promise; but if the disciples could be with him without his coming, he, of course, knew it, and therefore made a promise which was entirely useless. From this text, then, we must conclude that Christ's disciples are not yet with him, for his coming is still in the future. We call the reader's attention to other texts which confirm this conclusion. *SITI July 24, 1884, page 441.5*

Paul exhorts us to set our affection on things above and says: "When Christ, who is our life, *shall appear*, *then* shall ye also appear with him in glory." *Colossians 3:4*. Note the adverb "then." It specifies the time when the saints will appear in glory; it is when Christ appears. *SITI July 24, 1884, page 441.6*

The apostle Peter gives instructions to the elders of the churches, exhorting them to labor faithfully, and says for their encouragement:

“And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.” *1 Peter 5:4*. The report is sure, but they are not expected before Christ comes. *SITI July 24, 1884, page 441.7*

Again he says: “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time.” *1 Peter 1:3-5*. The saints are kept by the power of God unto salvation; but the salvation is not to be given until the last time. Or, as Peter expresses it still more plainly in the *13th verse* of the same chapter: “Be sober, and hope to the hand for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ.” *SITI July 24, 1884, page 441.8*

In the third chapter of his second epistle to Timothy, the apostle Paul speaks of the prevailing degeneracy of the last days, and recommends the Bible as the only thing that will thoroughly furnish man to good works. He then continues: “I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine.” *2 Timothy 4:1, 2*. Here, then, we find when the Judgment is to take place; in connection with the coming of Christ. But if the dead are not judged until Christ comes, it necessarily follows that they do not receive any reward until that time. And this is exactly what the Saviour said, as quoted from *Matthew 16:27; Revelation 22:12*. *SITI July 24, 1884, page 441.9*

The apostle continues his exhortation to Timothy, and says, “I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.” *2 Timothy 4:7, 8*. The Judge is to give crowns at that day, says Paul. At what day? Why, at the day when he judges the living and dead, “at his

appearing and his kingdom.” Peter told the elders that they should receive their crown at the appearing of the chief Shepherd, and Paul says that all who love his appearing shall receive their crowns at the same time.*SITI July 24, 1884, page 441.10*

Paul says, “*Henceforth* there is *laid up* for me a crown of righteousness.” He had reached the close of his life, and was about to be “offered” as a sacrifice to the truth. He felt that his life-work had been faithfully done. Did he therefore expect to immediately enter upon his reward? No; he was sure of a crown, but he knew that it would not be given until the appearing of Christ.*SITI July 24, 1884, page 441.11*

We have seen that when Christ comes he will be accompanied by all the holy angels. *Matthew 25:31*. The work which the angels have to do is described in *Matthew 24:31*: “And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.” And this agrees with the words of the psalmist: “He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that he may judge his people. Gather my saints together unto me; those that have made a covenant with me by sacrifice.” *Psalms 50:4, 5*. By what means the saints are gathered to be with Christ, will be considered in another article. E. J. W.*SITI July 24, 1884, page 441.12*

“Christ the End of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 10, 28.

E. J. Waggoner

“For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.” *Romans 10:4*. This is supposed by antinomians to teach the abolition of the law. The text is not usually quoted in full, the objector contenting himself with the statement that “Christ is the end of the law,” meaning that Christ abolished the law. This text is so generally quoted in favor of the abolition of the law, that before we consider its real application, we will briefly show the absurdity of the popular interpretation.*SITI July 24, 1884, page 442.1*

1. If Christ abolished the law, then there can be no sin now, for “sin is the transgression of the law,” *1 John 3:4*, and “is not imputed

when there is no law.” *Romans 5:13*. And if there is no sin, there can be no punishment impending, and all men will be saved. Those texts, therefore, which speak of the “wrath of God,” and the “indignation,” “torment,” and “destruction,” to be visited upon sinners, are made of no effect. There is no one so much of a Universalist as he who claims that the law of God is abolished.*SITI July 24, 1884, page 442.2*

2. The text says that Christ is the end of the law “to every one that believeth.” The necessary inference is that he is not the end of the law to unbelievers. Those, therefore, who claim that the apostle by the expression “end of the law” means abolition of the law, must teach that the law is abolished only for Christians; that is that the law binds worldlings, but that Christians are under no obligation to it. And so it would follow that while an act performed by an unbeliever might be in violation of the law, and therefore a sin, the same act performed by a believer would be perfectly justifiable. We trust that there is no one who would hold to so monstrous a theory as this, yet that is a legitimate deduction from antinomian claims.*SITI July 24, 1884, page 442.3*

3. If Paul, in *Romans 10:4* means that the law is abolished for believers, it would follow that it has been abolished as many times as there are Christians, being done away every time a man is converted; and further, that whenever any believer falls away, and loses his faith, the law is for him re-enacted! The absurdity of this just conclusion must convince every one of the absurdity of the premise.*SITI July 24, 1884, page 442.4*

4. Again: From the parables of the wheat and the tares (*Matthew 13*), we learn that both righteous and wicked are to remain together on the earth until the end of the world. We know also that both classes have existed since the fall. It follows, therefore, from antinomian interpretation of *Romans 10:4*, that the law of God always has been, and will be until the end of time, both abolished and in full force at the same time! This is the climax of absurdity, and shows conclusively that whatever may be the meaning of *Romans 10:4*, it certainly does not teach that any part of God’s Law is, or ever will be, abolished, either for Christians or unbelievers.*SITI July 24, 1884, page 442.5*

And now as to what the text really does mean. The word “end” is often used in the sense of “object” or design. Thus in *James 5:11* we read, “Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord.” No one supposes that this means the end of the Lord’s existence, but the object of the Lord in allowing Job to suffer affliction. In like manner we understand *Romans 10:4* to teach that Christ meets the design of the law to those who believe. In order to understand how he does this, we must consider the end or design of the law. *SITI July 24, 1884, page 442.6*

In *Romans 7:10* the apostle says that the commandment (meaning the whole law) “was ordained to life.” That is, if man had never violated the law, it would insure his eternal life. This is what the Saviour said to the young man in *Matthew 19:17*, as previously noticed. In the next verse to the one under consideration (*Romans 10:5*) we read the same thing: “For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, that the man which doeth those things shall live by them.” But while this is true, the fact presents itself that no man has kept the law (*Romans 3:9, 19, 23*), and that in his natural condition no man can keep the law, because “the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.” *Romans 8:7*. How, then, can any one obtain eternal life, which the law was designed to bestow? The answer is, “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” *John 3:16*. “The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” *Romans 6:23*. The law was “ordained to life;” Christ is our life (*Colossians 3:4*), and is therefore the end of the law. *SITI July 24, 1884, page 442.7*

But this is only the result. It might be asked, “Does Christ accomplish this result for us, by freeing us from obligation to keep the law?” We answer, No; for since only those who do the commandments shall live by them (*Matthew 19:17; Romans 10:7*), it follows that no one can receive eternal life if he continues to violate them. Therefore since the object of the law was to give life, it must follow that it was also the design that it must be kept. So we read in *1 Timothy 1:5* that “the end of the commandment is charity,” etc. “Charity” is but another name for “love,” and this rendering is given in the Revised Version. But “love is the fulfilling of the law”

(*Romans 13:10*), or, as John says, “This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments.” *1 John 5:3*. We might therefore paraphrase *1 Timothy 1:5* thus: “Now the object or design of the commandment [or law, see *verse 9*] is that it should be fulfilled, or scrupulously kept.” This is self-evident; for whenever any law is given, it is certainly the design of the maker that it shall be kept. *SITI July 24, 1884, page 442.8*

We have already seen that no man has attained this end. “All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.” From past sins we are “justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.” *Romans 3:21*. But being justified through faith in Christ, we are still dependent on him, for without him we can do nothing.” *John 15:4, 5*. It is only by abiding in him that we are able to bear fruit. And this is why the apostle says of the Jews that they have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge. “For they being ignorant of God’s righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.” *Romans 10:3*. The righteousness of God is his law (*Isaiah 51:6, 7*), and the apostle means that the Jews, being zealous toward God, and desiring to serve him by keeping his commandments, had sought to do so in their own strength, and had failed. Their zeal was good, but their knowledge was deficient, in that they did not perceive that only in Christ could they hope to attain perfection. *SITI July 24, 1884, page 442.9*

To all believers, Christ is made “wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.” *1 Corinthians 1:30*. Not by freeing them from obligation to keep the law, for then he would be to them, not righteousness, but unrighteousness, or, in other words, would become the minister of sin. Without him our best efforts are failures; with him to strengthen us, we can do all things; and when at last we stand before God holy and without blemish, “not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing,” it will be because we have been made “complete in him.” *SITI July 24, 1884, page 442.10*

We think it must be evident to all that *Romans 10:4* can be pressed into antinomian service only by mutilating to the extent of leaving out the statement that Christ is the end of the law to believers only, and to them for nothing except righteousness, or obedience to it.

This subject will be considered still further in the light of other scriptures, in another article. E. J. W.*SITI July 24, 1884, page 442.11*

July 31, 1884

“The Sabbath-School” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 29.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—AUG. 16

1. In our last lesson, what Scripture was quoted concerning a time of tribulation? *SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.1*
2. What was this time of trouble to follow? *SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.2*
3. Show that the time of trouble referred to does not mean the destruction of Jerusalem. *SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.3*
4. Prove that the predicted tribulation was to come upon the people of God alone. *SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.4*
5. Repeat the words of prophecy that foretell such a period of tribulation. *Daniel 7:25. SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.5*
6. What power is here referred to as “wearing out” the saints of God? *SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.6*
7. How long were the saints and laws to be given into his hand? *SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.7*
8. To how many days is the sequel? *Revelation 12:6, 14. SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.8*
9. In symbolic prophecy what does a day represent? *Ezekiel 4:5, 6. SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.9*
10. Then how many days of papal supremacy and persecution were predicted? *SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.10*
11. From what date are they to be reckoned? *SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.11*

12. Then when would they end? *SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.12*
13. How was the papal power broken in 1798? *SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.13*
14. What did Christ say would be done to those days for the elect's sake? *Matthew 24:22. SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.14*
15. What must be meant by this? *SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.15*
16. What great movement produced a sentiment against persecution for conscience' sake? *SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.16*
17. What did the Lord say would immediately follow the tribulation of those days? *Matthew 24:29. SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.17*
18. How definitely is the beginning of the signs located? *Mark 13:24. SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.18*
19. When did the darkening of the sun and moon take place? *SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.19*
20. When was the prophecy concerning the falling of the stars fulfilled? *SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.20*
21. Is the shaking of the powers of the heavens a sign of the coming of the Lord, or something that occurs in connection with it? *2 Peter 3:10. SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.21*
22. Are there to be any signs besides those in the heavens? *Luke 21:25. SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.22*
23. When the signs begin to come to pass, what is near? *Luke 21:28. SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.23*
24. How can we tell when summer is approaching? *Luke 21:29, 30. SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.24*
25. Do the signs here considered just as surely prove that Christ's coming is near? *Verse 31; Matthew 24:32, 33. SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.25*

26. Are we to admit of any doubt concerning it?*SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.26*

27. If the Lord commands us to *know*, is it not a sin to remain ignorant?*SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.27*

In our last lesson we identified the time of tribulation, of *Matthew 24:21, 22*, with the period of wearing out the saints of the Most High, mentioned in *Daniel 7:25*. The power that was then to “wear out the saints,” is admitted by all commentators to be the papacy. The period of time during which they were to be given into its hand is stated as “a time and times, and the dividing of time.” Without entering into any discussion as to the length of a “time,” we can very easily determined how long this period of *Daniel 7:25* was. In *Revelation 12:14* we find the same period given as the length of time during which the “woman” (the Christian church) was nourished in the wilderness. In the sixth verse of the same chapter the same event is brought to view, and the time is said to be “a thousand two hundred and three-score [1260] days.” We may therefore read *Daniel 7:25* thus: “And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until [or during] a time and times and the dividing of time.”*SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.28*

But twelve hundred and sixty days, only three years and a half, would be rather an insignificant persecution; the time would be entirely too short to accomplish the wearing out of the saints; and besides we know that the persecution of the church by the papacy lasted much longer than that. We remember, therefore, that the prophecy in which this prediction occurs, is symbolic, and that the time brought to view is figurative. If we turn to *Ezekiel 4:4-6*, we shall find that in prophetic symbols a day represents a year. Substituting this, we are warranted in reading *Daniel 7:25* thus: And he shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into this hand for twelve hundred and sixty years.*SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.29*

This period of papal rule began in 538 A.D., when, by the overthrow of the Ostrogoths Justinian’s decree that the bishop of Rome should

be head of all the churches, went into effect. Twelve hundred and sixty years from that date would bring us to A.D. 1798, for the close of papal supremacy; and just at that time it was that Pope Pius VI. was taken prisoner by the French, and the temporal dimension of the papacy was destroyed, never again to be restored to its former glory. That the years intervening between these two dates were filled with persecutions which literally “wore out” the people of God, is fully attested by history. The “tribulation” may doubtless be considered as beginning before 538 A.D., for under pagan rule the Christians suffered terrible persecutions; but pagan persecution did not begin to compare in fiendish malignity with those waged by the apostate Christian church against the true followers of Christ.*SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.30*

“But for the elect’s sake, those days shall be shortened.” What days? Not the days of papal supremacy, for the time of its continuance had been definitely fixed years before. Our Lord must refer to the days of persecution by the papal power. Had that persecution been pushed to the close of the 1260 years with all the relentless rigor that characterized it in its height, none of the people of God (no flesh), as the Bible says, would have escaped. But in the providence of God the Reformation arose. God did not design that his truth and people should be utterly exterminated, so that he could have no witnesses upon earth. So he moved on the hearts of devout men like Luther, to preach the word, showing that man must be justified by faith, and not by penances, pilgrimages, or the payment of coin. Their preaching was accompanied with such power that thousands were constrained to believe the glad message of salvation through Christ alone; and when the rulers of various European States espoused the new light, and refused to yield abject obedience to the commands of the pope of Rome, the persecution was gradually diminished, until about the middle of the eighteenth century, it virtually ceased. So for the elect’s sake the days were shortened.*SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.31*

“Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened,” etc. As recorded by Mark (*chap. 13:24*) our Saviour was still more explicit in his prediction. After speaking of the affliction above noted, he said: “But *in those days, after that tribulation*, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light.” We

must therefore look for the fulfillment of the sign somewhere between the middle of the eighteenth century and the year 1798. Do we find it? The dark day of May 19, 1780, is one of the notable events of history. A brief description may be found in "Webster's Unabridged Dictionary," the list of "Noted Names," etc. The darkness extended over the entire day, after ten o'clock in the morning, and through the greater part of the night falling. Although the moon was then full, not a ray of light was to be seen. Even in the day-time the darkness was so great that no work could be done out of doors, and persons who were out were actually unable to find their way home. Fowls went to roost in the forenoon, as though it were night. History contains no parallel to this wonderful event.*SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.32*

Many have sought to find an explanation for the darkness of May 19, 1780 thinking thereby to destroy its value as a sign of the Lord's coming. None of these efforts have been successful, and so good authority is that quoted above (Webster) says: "The true cause of this remarkable phenomenon is unknown." However, even if it were possible for anyone to explain it on scientific grounds, that would not in the least invalidate the claim that it is a true sign of the Lord's coming. Mark the fact that Jesus did not say that a darkening of the sun should occur, which nobody could account for. What he did say was that at a certain time such an event should occur; its occurrence at the exact time specified establishes it beyond all controversy as a valid sign of the end.*SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.33*

"And the stars shall fall from heaven." This was fulfilled in the memorable meteoric shower of Nov. 13, 1833. It accurately fulfilled *Revelation 6:13*, which likens the falling of the stars to the falling of unripe figs, when the tree is shaken by a mighty wind. Prof. Olmstead, of Yale College, said:-*SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.34*

"Those who were so fortunate as to witness the exhibition of shooting stars on the morning of Nov. 13, 1833, probably saw the greatest display of celestial fire-works that has ever been seen since the creation of the world, or, at least, within the annals covered by the pages of history."*SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.35*

“When these things begin to come to pass then look up, and lift up your head; for your redemption draweth night.” *Luke 21:28*. That is, the signs show that the Lord’s coming is near. Says one, “I don’t believe in frightening people with talk about the Lord’s coming.” Well, the Lord didn’t say anything about getting frightened. He was speaking to his disciples (not simply to those chosen twelve, but to all who should believe on him through their word); and he tells them to rejoice. Why should they not? Their best friend is coming to redeem them, and to take them to himself. Does the prisoner tremble at the coming of the one whom he knows will open its prison doors and let him walk at liberty? Does the bondman, toiling in weariness and pain, writhing under the lash of the taskmaster, become frightened at the thought that the time of this cruel bondage is nearly over, and that one is coming who will make him a free man? Then certainly the Christian will only rejoice at the thought that his Saviour is coming to end all his trials and temptations, and to give him an everlasting home in the mansions of light. The Lord saves those who love his appearing, and those who love his appearing will not shrink from it with alarm.*SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.36*

How do we know when summer is approaching? By certain infallible signs. We see the buds begin to swell, the leaves begin to appear, and the tiny blades of grass shoot forth from the ground. When those things begin to take place, we know that summer is not far distant. No one could make us believe differently. “So likewise ye,” says the Saviour, “when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand.” *Luke 21:31*. This is a direct command. We are not to disbelieve, nor to be in doubt, nor to guess that he is near, but to *know*. To disregard this command is certainly a sin, as well as to disobey any other injunction. If we study his words carefully, how can we help knowing? How near is it? “Even *at the doors*.” The day and hour are not given, nor is it necessary that they should be. When we are informed that a friend is at our door, we do not require a message telling us when to prepare to receive him. If we are not then ready, we know that we have no time to lose. No expression could more strongly convey the fact that Christ’s coming is close upon us.*SITI July 31, 1884, page 454.37*

And how shall we prepare for that momentous event? “Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.” *Matthew 7:21*. If we would be enter into Christ’s kingdom, we must obey the laws of that kingdom. There will be none but loyal subjects there. Treason will not be found. Let us then, by the aid of Christ and his Holy Spirit, have the law of God so written in our hearts that we may be found unto praise and honor and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ. E. J. *WSITI July 31, 1884, page 454.38*

“The Reason Why” The Signs of the Times, 10, 29.

E. J. Waggoner

For years people were content to keep the first day of the week as the Sabbath because they were taught from childhood that this was right. No one felt called upon to give a special reason for doing that which no one questioned. We say that no one questioned the correctness of their action, not because there were none who condemned first-day observance both by word and act, but because those who kept the seventh day were so few in number as to be practically unknown. And so people kept Sunday because their parents did, and were content. Whenever the good people wished to reason with a worldlyling who would persist in finding his own pleasure on the first day of the week, they would quote, “Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy,” taking it as a matter of course that “Sabbath” meant Sunday, and that the fourth commandment was gotten up for the express purpose of protecting the first day from worldly toil and pleasure. *SITI July 31, 1884, page 457.1*

But the time came when their quiet was disturbed. Those who read the commandment far enough to find out that “the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord,” and had the courage to obey the commandment as it reads, preached the “new” doctrine with such vigor as to attract general attention. To the surprise of all the people who were quietly following custom, and to the disgust of many of them, it was found that the seventh day really is the Sabbath of the Bible, that it was that day that received the divine blessing and sanctification in the beginning, and that unfortunately the Bible

writers had omitted to say anything about a change of the day of weekly rest. Some persons very sensibly concluded that if the Lord had wanted men to observe the first day of the week instead of the seventh he would have said something about it, and immediately adopted God's original plan. The reason that God was abundantly able to make known his will, that he had done so very clearly in times past, even concerning matters of seemingly little importance, and that when he had not spoken it was very presumptuous in man to speak for him. See *Ezekiel 13:7.SITI July 31, 1884, page 457.2*

Others, however, acted on the principle that Sunday-keeping *must* be right because, (1) It has been kept by nearly all the world for many centuries; (2) The leaders of the church do not accept the seventh-day Sabbath (see *John 7:47, 48*), and they certainly ought to know what is right; (3) It would be very inconvenient to make a change; and therefore (4) They were determined not to change. Having come to this conclusion, they felt that it was incumbent on them to give some reason for their course of action, especially since they were very strongly urged to do so by those who kept the Sabbath "according to the commandment." Accordingly they promptly gave, substantially, the following "reasons:"-*SITI July 31, 1884, page 457.3*

1. "The Sabbath was changed from the seventh to the first day of the week, because Christ rose from the dead on that day."*SITI July 31, 1884, page 457.4*

2. "The first day of the week is the one that was originally sanctified. The Jews were too wicked to be allowed to keep it, so the Lord let them keep Saturday for a while; but there has really been no change at all in the Sabbath day."*SITI July 31, 1884, page 457.5*

3. "We keep Sunday because the world is round, and it is impossible to keep any one day."*SITI July 31, 1884, page 457.6*

4. "The seventh day is indeed the Sabbath, and all men ought to keep it, for it is plainly commanded; but we can't tell which day of the week is the seventh, and therefore we keep the first."*SITI July 31, 1884, page 457.7*

5. "The seventh day was the Sabbath from the beginning, but the

Jews lost their reckoning while in Egypt, and since that time nobody has had the correct reckoning of the time.”*SITI July 31, 1884, page 457.8*

6. “The Jews lost the correct reckoning during the Babylonian captivity, and consequently no one can tell whether or not the day that they now keep is the true seventh day.”*SITI July 31, 1884, page 457.9*

7. “Christ kept the seventh-day Sabbath, and so did his disciples, “according to the commandment;” but during the dark ages of papal supremacy much time was lost; indeed, no reckoning whatever was kept for a long time, and so it is absolutely impossible to tell whether our Saturday is the seventh or the fourth day of the week, or even to tell in what year of the Christian era we are now living.”*SITI July 31, 1884, page 457.10*

8. “We keep the first day of the week because, after the resurrection of Christ, the apostles kept it, and from their time to the present we have an uninterrupted record of Sunday observance.”*SITI July 31, 1884, page 457.11*

9. “The commandment enjoins the observance of the only a seventh part of time; there is nowhere in the Bible a command to keep a definite day, so we keep Sunday.”*SITI July 31, 1884, page 457.12*

10. “The ten commandments are now abolished, and the New Testament is the Christians only guide; but it is not a book of laws, and we don’t find in it the express command for Sabbath observance, and we therefore observe the first day of the week.”*SITI July 31, 1884, page 457.13*

These are only a few of the many “reasons” given for keeping Sunday rather than the seventh day. As will be readily surmised, they were not developed in council, but were “sought out” by different individuals as occasion required. We but state the simple truth, however, when we say we have heard every one of the above “reasons” given in a single discourse, and that by a minister who was held in high repute as a man of learning. Whenever the above-mentioned “reasons” seemed unsatisfactory, others were given that

were equally conclusive!*SITI July 31, 1884, page 457.14*

In spite of all this, people would wonder why the Bible contains no command for Sunday observance. The “new” Sunday-keeping was right, but felt hurt that the Lord had not vouchsafed them one word of encouragement. If only one text could be found, what a relief it would be. Such ones may set their minds at rest. The Rev. J. M. Bailey, D. D., has found out just the reason why the Bible is silent on the subject of first-day observance; and he has given his discovery to the world through the columns of the *Morning Star*, a Free-Will Baptist journal published in Dover, N. H. He says:*SITI July 31, 1884, page 457.15*

“It appears that the convocation was changed from the seventh to the first on the very day of the resurrection of Christ. *What he said to the disciples about it to convince them, we have no means of knowing.* [Italics ours.] He met some of them several times that day, and then appeared in their assembly where they met with closed doors for fear of the Jews, and sanctioned their meeting by breathing on them the Holy Spirit, and sending them forth as the Father had sent him. *Probably for fear of the Jews, what he said against Judaism, or in favor of the Christian Sabbath, was not published.*”*SITI July 31, 1884, page 457.16*

Do not smile, dear reader. This was written in sober earnest, by a learned D. D., for the express purpose of combating the *errors* of seventh-day keepers. We do not know how he regards his work, but it is our opinion that he leaves nothing more to be said. Before closing we wish to ask, Who was it that was so fearful? Was it Christ, who denounced the Jews to their face, calling them hypocrites? Of course he did not fear personal violence to himself. Was it Peter who feared to tell what Christ did say against the Sabbath and in favor of Sunday?-he who faced the Jewish Sanhedrim, and, charging that body with the murder of Jesus, only declared that “we ought to obey God rather than man.” Paul was not present on that night, but he was “not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles” (*2 Corinthians 11:5*), being taught by the Lord Jesus himself. *Galatians 1:11, 12*. No one can accuse him of fearing to preach the word, and he himself declared that he had not shunned to declare “all the counsel of God.” *Acts 20:26, 27*; but he

has left nothing on record concerning Sunday-keeping. *SITI July 31, 1884, page 457.17*

We need not pursue the subject further. We will simply say that we too believe that fear operated to a certain extent to prevent the disciples from preaching that the Sabbath was changed. Not the fear of the Jews, but fear of disobeying Christ's instruction in *Matthew 28:19, 20*; fear of being found false witnesses of God, and bringing upon themselves the curse recorded in *Galatians 1:8, 9*. E. J. W. *SITI July 31, 1884, page 457.18*

August 7, 1884

“The Sabbath-School” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—AUG. 23

1. What events did Christ name as signs of this coming? *SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.1*
2. What have as to their fulfillment? *SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.2*
3. How surely do these signs prove his coming to be near? *SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.3*
4. What expression shows the nearness of the coming? *SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.4*
5. What did the Lord say would not pass before his words would be fulfilled? *Verse 34. SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.5*
6. To what generation must he refer? *SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.6*
7. Cite another instance where the term “this generation” issues with reference to a people not living at the time. *Psalms 95:8-10. SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.7*
8. What reason had the disciples for not expecting the Lord’s coming in their day? *Matthew 24:4-8. SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.8*
9. What was Paul’s teachings on this point? *2 Thessalonians 1:2. SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.9*
10. What did he say must first come? *Verses 3, 4. SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.10*
11. Why may we be so confident that the Lord will, in this generation? *Matthew 24:35. SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.11*

12. Can any man tell the exact time when the Lord will come?
Verse 36.SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.12

13. Show how we may know a thing to be near, and yet not know just when it will come.*SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.13*

14. Are we to expect that all will heed these signs of Christ's coming? *2 Peter 3:3, 4.SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.14*

15. Will the last days be days of quiet to the humble Christian? *2 Timothy 3:1.SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.15*

16. What will make the last days perilous? *Verses 2-4.SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.16*

17. To what time does Christ liken the days immediately preceding his coming? *Matthew 24:27.SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.17*

18. How wicked were the people in the days of Noah? *Genesis 6:5.SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.18*

19. Upon what were they wholly intent? *Matthew 24:38, 39.SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.19*

20. Against what does Christ warn us? *Luke 21:34.SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.20*

21. In what condition does he say we must be? *Luke 12:35, 36.SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.21*

22. Can we be said to be waiting for that which we are not prepared to receive?*SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.22*

23. Since the times are dangerous, and we know not how soon the Lord will come, what are we expected to do? *Mark 13:37.SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.23*

24. While waiting and watching what else must we do? *Luke 21:36.SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.24*

There are some things that all men may know. There are others which are concealed, concerning which it is useless for man to

inquire. It is written: "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law." *Deuteronomy 29:29*. This is perfectly reasonable. If the Lord has revealed a thing, it is most certainly for our benefit. Whenever, therefore, we find definite statements in the Bible concerning any event, we may speak of that event with the utmost positiveness to the extent that the statements are made. Now let us apply this to the subject of the Lord's coming. We *know*, (1) That the Lord will come again. We have his own word for that. (2) That his second coming will be as literal as his first,—"this same Jesus,"—and that it will be so glorious, and accompanied with such manifestations that no one can be ignorant of it. *Matthew 24:27; Revelation 1:7; 1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17*. (3) That before his coming certain signs will take place. (4) That these signs, as recorded in *Matthew 24*, and learned in our last lesson, are the darkening of the sun and moon, and the falling of the stars. (5) That these signs have actually taken place in the exact manner foretold by our Saviour. We do not obtain our knowledge of any of the above things by any process of reasoning, but by plain statements of fact. There is yet one thing more that we may know, that we are commanded to know. The Lord, after having informed the disciples of the signs above-mentioned, said: "When ye shall see all these things, know that it [margin, *he*, that is, Christ] is near, even at the doors." *Matthew 24:33*. We are to know it just as certainly as we know that summer is near when the leaves begin to appear on the trees. There can, then, be no more doubt that the coming of the Lord is near, than there is that the stars fell in 1833. *SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.25*

"Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled." *Matthew 24:34*. There need be no difficulty in understanding this verse. He certainly did not mean to say that his coming would take place before the close of the generation then living, for that would be a contradiction of his own words in *verses 4-8*, and is directly contradicted by Paul in *2 Thessalonians 2:1-8*. Moreover, whoever claims that Christ did mean that he would come before that generation should pass, must also claim that the dead have been raised and the living translated. *1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17*. The fact that Christ has not yet come is sufficient proof that he did not predict an immediate coming. Then what did he mean? This

can be answered by finding out of what time he was speaking. It was not of the time then present, for he was looking forward. He had spoken of the destruction of Jerusalem; he had described the 1260 years of papal supremacy, with its disastrous results to the people of God; and he had minutely described the signs that were to follow; the last of which took place, as we have seen, in 1833. Looking at that time, he said, "This generation shall not pass to all these things be fulfilled." What things? The things recorded in verse. A similar use of the expression "this generation" is found in *Psalms 95:10*. There are hundreds of persons now alive who witnessed the falling of the stars in 1833. Does anybody doubt that some of that generation will be alive when the Lord comes? Hear what the Saviour says: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." *Matthew 24:35. SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.26*

"But of that day and hour knoweth no man." Here is one of the secret things that belong to God alone. The exact time has not been revealed; therefore we have nothing to do with it; it does not concern us. Yet our ignorance of the exact time does not in the least affect our knowledge of what is revealed, namely, that his coming is near. The farmer knows when summer is near, yet he cannot tell the day when it will be fairly open. We often speak of a friend as coming very soon, yet we do not know the exact time of his coming. After Christ has given us such unmistakable evidences of the nearness of his coming, it is not only foolish but wicked to pay no attention to them, simply because he has not revealed to us the day and hour. *SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.27*

The fact that comparatively few even of religious people believe in and teach the doctrine of the near coming of the Lord, is sometimes urged as proof that the doctrine cannot be true. If no one believed it, that would not invalidate the Scripture record in the least; the Scripture cannot be broken by the unbelief of man. But the fact that but few are looking for the Lord's coming is one of the signs by which we may know that we are in the last days. Paul says that in the last days perilous times will come, because men shall be lovers of their own selves. *2 Timothy 3:1*. Then he gives a list of special sins of which they will be guilty, and to show that he does not refer to the non-professing world, he says, "Having a form of godliness,

but denying the power thereof.” “They profess that they know God; but in *works* they deny him.” *Titus 1:16*. And this is in *the last days*. *SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.28*

Moreover, our Saviour himself has given a description of the time immediately preceding his coming. He said: “And as it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man.” *Luke 17:26*. To find, then, what will be a characteristic of the last days, we have only to read a description of the time just before the flood. Here it is: “And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.” *Genesis 6:5*. Here is total depravity. If it had been otherwise the Lord would not have destroyed the people of that time. When the Lord comes it is to destroy the inhabitants of the earth. (The righteous are simply sojourners, and not dwellers.) But he would not destroy them unless they were incorrigibly wicked. We are therefore not to expect any great reformation before the coming of the Lord, or general preparation for that event. Yet the warning is to be given just as faithfully, and people are to be just as earnestly exhorted to repent, as though all were expected to reform. All must hear. “This gospel of the kingdom” must be preached to all the world for a *witness*. The world has not yet arrived at that state of wickedness described by our Saviour. It is the faithful preaching of the word that will call out the few that will turn to God, and harden the others in their rebellion. The preaching of truth always causes a division. *Luke 12:52, 53*. And when the word shall have been preached in all the world, separating men into the two classes, “*then shall the end come.*” It is for this alone that the coming of the Lord now waits. E. J. W. *SITI August 7, 1884, page 470.29*

“Christ the End of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 10, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

In our last article, two weeks ago, we showed how it is that “Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.” We wish to consider this matter a little further, for, as we then said, there is very much that might be said upon it. Indeed, the whole gospel is comprised in that one sentence; for the gospel is simply the good news of how men who have broken the law may be saved,

through Christ, and enabled to keep it. In all our investigations let it be borne in mind that the righteousness of God is contained in his law (*Isaiah 51:4-7*), and that Christ is the end of the law only for righteousness, which is equivalent to saying that he is the object of the law for obedience. *SITI August 7, 1884, page 473.1*

We now call the attention of the reader very briefly to the seventh chapter of Romans. We have space to notice only a portion of the chapter. In that the apostle brings to view, using himself as an illustration, the progress of a man from a state of worldly, carnal security, to that of acceptance with God. Let us follow him in his narrative. *SITI August 7, 1884, page 473.2*

First we notice his statement in *verse 7* that the law is not sin. This he proves by showing that it is the law which points out and forbids sin. Then, of course, it must be perfect. We can detect base coin only by using genuine coin as a standard. The parallel to this verse is found in *chap. 3:20*, where he says: "By the law is the knowledge of sin." He continues, "For without the law sin was dead." *Verse 8*. This is the statement of *verse 7* in another form. Before the law was brought to his knowledge, he did not know sin; it did not trouble him any. Although he did not know the law, he was a sinner, yet his sin, so far as his knowledge was concerned, was dead. *SITI August 7, 1884, page 473.3*

"For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died." *Verse 9*. Without the law ("the commandment") he was in a state of ease and carnal security, perfectly satisfied with himself. But when the law was applied, it made his sin assume hideous proportions. He saw himself just as he was. "And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death." *Verse 10*. How is this? The commandment (law) was ordained to life: that is, its object was to give life, which it will always do to those who obey it. "The man which doeth these things shall live by them." *Romans 10:5*. This was the object of the law, but now that the law has been violated, it cannot fulfill the end for which it was designed; it can only condemn to death. Mark this well; around this fact the whole argument centers. *SITI August 7, 1884, page 473.4*

And how did the apostle regard that law which, by showing him to be such a sinner, had condemned him to death? Said he: "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." *Verse 12*. He acknowledged the perfectness of the law. And herein he showed his honesty of heart. He did not rail at the law, applying to it all manner of opprobrious epithets, and try to evade it or convince himself that it was abolished. No; he confessed himself a sinner, justly condemned by a perfect law. He recognized the fact that the law had done nothing to him: it had not created in him, but had simply brought to light that which previously existed. The effect of introducing the law is to make sin appear exceeding sinful. It is as a rod thrust to the bottom of a vessel of water, which roils the water by stirring up the sediment that lay in the bottom, yet it creates no impurity whatever. The dirt would be there if the rod were not introduced; therefore Paul did not complain, for he knew that the fault was in himself, and not in the law. So he exclaims: "For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin." *SITI August 7, 1884, page 473.5*

In *verse 9* Paul anticipates his argument, when he says, "And I died." This was the final result in his case. What does he mean by this? In the light of the preceding verse the answer is clear. When he was alive, it was when he was without the law-lawless; a servant of sin. Death is the direct opposite of life; therefore when the commandment came, and he died, it must mean that he yielded to the claims of the law, and ceased sinning. And this will be the result with every one who is as honest with himself as Paul was. This is conversion. But as before said, the apostle anticipates in order to place the effect side by side with the cause; he did not die without a struggle. *SITI August 7, 1884, page 473.6*

We have now the man before us as a convicted sinner, and here is his description: "For that which I do I allow not; for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I." *Verse 15*. This verse is introduced by "for," showing that it is a consequence of something that goes before. The preceding clause is, "But I am carnal, sold under sin." Now what is the condition of a man who is sold into slavery? He is unable to do anything for himself. He may be conscious of the degradation of his position, and long to be free, but he is placed where he cannot help himself; his hands or feet are

bound with a chain. Every sinner is in bondage. (See *2 Peter 2:19*.) Before the law of God is held up before him, he is unconscious of his slavery; when he sees its claims, he arouses to a sense of his condition. But his struggle to break the galling chain is fruitless, because his long-continued bondage has weakened him. This struggle of the convicted sinner against sin is mentioned in several verses of this chapter. *SITI August 7, 1884, page 473.7*

“If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now, then, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.” *Verses 16, 17*. Here we have the case of a man convicted of sin by the law, conscientiously trying to keep it, and yet continually violating it, even against his will. “It is not I that do it,” he says; “I do not design to violate the law; but sin has bound me so long, and has such power over me, that I cannot get free.” It is no longer from desire that he sins, but from the force of habit which he cannot break. *SITI August 7, 1884, page 473.8*

And so the fruitless struggle goes on, until the man in an agony of despair, exclaims: “O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?” *Verse 24*. We cannot imagine a more horrible condition than the one here brought to view. In ancient times a criminal was sometimes chained to the dead body of a man, and forced to drag the putrefying carcass wherever he went, until the effluvium caused him to die a miserable death. Think of the desperate attempts such a man would make to get free, and how frantic he would become as he realized the impotence of his arm as compared with the chain that bound him. How his whole soul would go out in that piteous cry, “Who shall deliver me from this body of death?” How many are there who have felt themselves in such a condition under the load of sin? *SITI August 7, 1884, page 473.9*

It is in this condition the apostle (the representative of a class) finds himself. He feels that sin is about to sink him into perdition, and, convinced of the hopelessness of his struggle, he cries out for deliverance, “Who shall deliver me from this body of death?” Immediately the question is answered, and he again exclaims, this time with transports of joy, “I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.” As soon as he realizes his own inability to meet the demands of the law, Christ is presented to his view, and he at once accepts

deliverance from the only one who can give it. Christ strikes off the chain, and sets the prisoner free. Not only does he forgive past transgressions, but he helps us to break the chains of habit, and overcome the love of sin. And then the apostle continues: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." The reason why there is not, is told in the following verses, in which it is said that he who is in Christ keeps the law of God; he "walks not after the flesh, but after the Spirit;" in other words, "he is a new creature." *SITI August 7, 1884, page 473.10*

This argument is not complete without *verse 3 and 4 of the 8th chapter*: "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." What could not the law do? It could not justify any man, and give him life. Wherein lay its weakness? Not in itself, but in "the flesh." It is the fault of man that the law condemns him, and not the fault of the law. The law cannot give life, because it has been violated. And in this extremity what did God do? He sent his own Son. What for? That the righteousness of the law (*i.e.*, the law in its perfectness) might be accomplished by us. What we could not do while yet in bondage to sin, we may perform when we become free men in Christ. *SITI August 7, 1884, page 474.1*

Righteousness is required of us, and that means that there is something for us to do, for righteousness is simply right doing. But Christ says, "Without me ye can do nothing." Our own righteousness, that is, the good that we attempt to do by our own unaided efforts, amounts to nothing. It is not righteousness at all, but unrighteousness. When, however, we join the strength of Christ to our own weakness, we can truly say, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me." E. J. W. *SITI August 7, 1884, page 474.2*

August 14, 1884

“The Sabbath-School” The Signs of the Times, 10, 31.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—SEPT. 6

1. For what purpose will Christ, the second time? *John 14:3.SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.1*
2. What is implied by the last clause of this verse?*SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.2*
3. When does Paul say that the saints will be with Christ? *Colossians 3:4.SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.3*
4. As Paul was about to die, what did he say was laid up for him? *2 Timothy 4:8.SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.4*
5. When will this crown be given? *Ib.SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.5*
6. What is the testimony of Peter on this point? *1 Peter 5:4.SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.6*
7. What, then, is the Christian’s hope? *Titus 2:11-13.SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.7*
8. What is his incentive to patience under trials? *James 5:8.SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.8*
9. When will salvation brought to God’s people? *1 Peter 1:5, 13.SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.9*
10. How does Paul describe the coming of the Lord and its attendant circumstances? *1 Thessalonians 4:15-17.SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.10*
11. What authority does he give for these statements?*SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.11*

12. What is meant by the words, “we shall not prevent them which are asleep”? *SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.12*

13. What was the necessity for such an assurance? *SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.13*

14. Do people nowadays generally think that the living receive the reward before those that have died? *SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.14*

15. What is the first thing that takes place when the Lord comes? *Verse 16. SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.15*

16. What is the next occurrence? *Verse 17. SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.16*

17. Whom did the living saints and those raised from the dead meet in the air? *SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.17*

18. How long do they remain with him? *SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.18*

19. Then when and how are all the saints taken to be with Christ? *SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.19*

20. Show that God did not design that the patriarchs, prophets, and others should receive their reward before we do. *Hebrews 11:39, 40. SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.20*

“And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.” *John 14:3.* The thoughtful reader cannot fail to notice that the same text which contains the promise of Christ’s coming, is also the reason for that coming. For what purpose is he coming? “*That where I am, there ye may be also.*” Now we will make a statement which must be self evident; Christ will not do that for which there is no reason; we cannot conceive of his doing such a thing. Then if he has promised to come to earth for a certain purpose, the necessity for his coming must still exist, else he will not come. But he will come, because his promise stands on record; therefore the reason which he gave for his coming does exist still. So we ask again. For

what purpose did he say he would come? Anybody may read the answer in Christ's own words, that it was to receive his disciples to himself. Then it must follow that they are not with him now; for if they were, there would be no reason for him to return for them. It would be the height of absurdity for Christ return to earth for his disciples, if they were already in Heaven. We hope no one is bold enough to accuse Christ of such foolishness as that. *SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.21*

There is another thought on this verse that is worthy of notice. It is this: Since Christ promised to return for his disciples, it must be that he did not contemplate such a thing as that they would go to him before he should return. He could see what was in the future, and if the disciples were going to be with him at any time before his second coming, he knew it. But if such had been the case, he would not have said that the object of his coming was to take them to himself. The fact, therefore, that he did make the receiving of them to himself the object of his coming, shows that he did not know that they could be with him without his coming, and that is equivalent to saying that they could not be with him unless he should come. *SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.22*

Paul adds the weight of his inspired testimony to that of our Saviour. Said he: "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." *Colossians 3:4*. Notice the adverb of time. When Christ shall appear, *then* shall ye appear with him. No comment on this text could make it any clearer than it is as it stands. Read it, and accept it in its most obvious sense, and you have the main facts concerning the second coming of Christ. *SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.23*

Again the apostle says: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at *that day*; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." *2 Timothy 4:7, 8*. He had reached the end of his course, and he had confidence of his acceptance with God. Did he therefore say, I shall therefore receive my reward immediately? No; "*henceforth*," *i.e.*, from this time onward, "there is *laid up* for me a crown of righteousness." Well, how long is it to remain "laid up"?

The answer is implied in the closing part of the verse: "And not to me only, but to all them also *that love his appearing*. We would gather from this that the crowns are given at the appearing of Christ. But we are not left to conjecture an inference in so important a matter. Peter exhorts the elders of the church of Christ to do their duty faithfully, and says by way of encouragement: "And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." *1 Peter 5:4*. That is when the crowns will be given. If they are given when Christ appears, they cannot be given before. *SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.24*

It is with this in view that the apostle James exhorts the brethren to patience. "Be ye also patient, stablish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord draweth night." *James 5:8*. The full force of his exhortation cannot be appreciated unless we read the previous verses. He begins the chapter with an arraignment of certain ones for oppressing the poor. He says to them: "Ye have condemned and killed the just; and he doth not resist you." *Verse 6*. And then turning immediately to the brethren-the oppressed ones-he says: "Be patient therefore brethren, unto the coming of the Lord." As much as to say, Endure these things patiently, however unjust they may be, for the Lord is coming soon, and then you will receive your reward. And with all this Peter heartily agrees when he says: "Be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ." *1 Peter 1:13. SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.25*

In *1 Thessalonians 4:15-17* Paul gives a most graphic description of the coming of the Lord. He prefaces his account with the statement that it is "by the word of the Lord;" he did not give it on his own authority. We that remain until the coming of the Lord, he says, shall not go before them that are asleep. The Thessalonian brethren did not comprehend the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and supposed that there departed friends were lost forever; that only those who should be living at the time of the Lord's coming could share in its glory. The apostle comforts them with the assurance that the living shall not have any precedence over the dead. Take particular notice, however, of what Paul did *not* say. He did not say, as many a modern comforter would do, "We shall not go before them which are asleep; on the contrary, they have gone

before us, and are now safe in the arms of Jesus.” This is what Paul did *not* say. Had he said so, some of his brethren might have inquired if all who go before to the arms of Jesus, spend their time sleeping. If the doctrine that the saints receive their reward at death had been believed in by Paul, here would have been a grand opportunity to present. But he did not do so. Let us see why. *SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.26*

“For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: *then* we which are alive and remain shall be caught up *together with them* in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord.” *1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17.* This is what Paul *did* say. The “dead in Christ” shall rise. What did they care about that? Why, he was telling them about their dead friends. Yes, but when he introduced the subject, he was speaking of “them which are asleep;” them “which sleep in Jesus.” Exactly; and now he uses this other term in reference to the same class; and so we learn that those “which sleep in Jesus,” are “the dead in Christ.” They are to “rise” when the Lord comes; and further, they will “rise first;” that is, before the living are taken. As soon as the dead have been raised, *then* “we which are alive and remain shall be caught up *together with them* in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air.” So neither class has the precedence; the living do not go to be with the Lord before those that have died; the dead are not now enjoying the bliss of Heaven while the living are toiling in this world; but at the coming of the Lord both shall together be taken to be with him. *SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.27*

“And so shall we ever be with the Lord.” Explicit enough, is it not? How shall we be with the Lord? By the resurrection of the righteous dead and the translation of the living, which will take place at his coming. And notice that this takes in the whole multitude of the disciples of Christ; for it comprises all that are dead, and all who are alive when the Lord comes, and there can be no other class. There is, then, no other means revealed in the Bible, whereby men may be with the Lord except these two of resurrection and translation. A few favored ones, as Enoch and Elijah, and those who came from their graves at the resurrection of Christ, were not obliged to wait until the coming of the Lord; but they were taken only by one of the

two ways mentioned-resurrection from the dead and translation without seeing death.*SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.28*

It is interesting to note the harmony of the different portions of the Bible on this point. What we were forced to conclude from the promise of Christ, namely, that his disciples could not be with him until he comes, is stated in plain words by Paul. Besides what we have read above, we have his testimony in *Hebrews 11*. In that chapter Paul speaks of Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Moses, Gideon, David, Samuel, and many martyrs, “of whom the world was not worthy,” and says: “And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.” vs 39, 40. What stronger testimony is needed? One needs only to read the plain texts of Scripture to be convinced that to the people of God the coming of the Lord is everything. Without that, all their hopes are lost. It is the time of their reward.*SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.29*

“Them which sleeping Jesus.” On this clause Dr. Albert Barnes comments as follows:-*SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.30*

“A most beautiful expression. It is not merely that they have a calm repose-like a gentle slumber-in the hope of waking again, but that this is ‘*in Jesus*’-or ‘through’ (*dia*) him; that is, his death and resurrection are the cause of their quiet and calm repose. They do not ‘sleep’ in heathenism, or in infidelity, or in the gloom of atheism, but in the blessed hope which Jesus has imparted. They lie, *as he did*, in the tomb-free from pain and sorrow, and with the certainty of being raised up again.”*SITI August 14, 1884, page 486.31*

On the expression in *2 Timothy 4:8*: “Unto all them also that love his appearing,” Dr. Barnes says:-*SITI August 14, 1884, page 487.1*

“That is, all who *desire* his second coming. Faith in the second advent of the Lord Jesus as coming to judge the world, and a desire for his return, became a kind of criterion by which Christians were known. No others but true Christians were supposed to believe in his return to our world, and no others truly desired it. Compare *Revelation 1:7; 22:20*. It is so now. It is one of the characteristics of a true Christian that he *believes* that Christ will come again to judge

the world; that he sincerely *desires* his return, and that he would *welcome* his appearing in the clouds of heaven." E. J. W.*SITI*
August 14, 1884, page 487.2

August 21, 1884

“The Sabbath-School” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 32.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST.—SEPT. 13

1. How should we live in this world? *Titus 2:11, 12.SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.1*
2. For what are we to be looking? *Verse 13.SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.2*
3. What is the blessed hope?*SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.3*
4. Why is the coming of the Lord called a blessed hope? *John 14:3.SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.4*
5. By what means are the followers of Christ taken to be with him? *1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17.SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.5*
6. Are we to hope for an immediate reward for our good deeds? *Luke 14:12.SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.6*
7. When are we to expect our recompense? *Verses 13, 14.SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.7*
8. When does the resurrection of the dead take place? Give proof.*SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.8*
9. What did Christ promise those who believe on him? *John 6:40.SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.9*
10. When did the prophet David say that he would be satisfied? *Psalms 17:15.SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.10*
11. And when will the saints be in the likeness of Christ? *1 John 3:2.SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.11*
12. For what was Paul persecuted by the Jews? *Acts 26:6, 7.SITI*

August 21, 1884, page 502.12

13. On another occasion how did he define his hope? *Acts 23:6.SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.13*

14. Then what facts do we learn from *Acts 26:6, 7?* *SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.14*

15. What sustained Abraham when he was commanded to offer up Isaac? *Hebrews 11:17-19.SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.15*

16. What comforted Job in his affliction? *Job 19:25-27.SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.16*

17. What did the prophet Isaiah say of a resurrection? *Isaiah 26:19.SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.17*

18. At what time did he locate it? *Verse 21.SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.18*

19. Will any but the righteous have a resurrection? *Acts 24:14, 15.SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.19*

20. To what are the righteous raised? *John 5:28, 29.SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.20*

21. What kind of a resurrection do the wicked have? *Ib.SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.21*

In the second chapter of Titus, Paul presents the proper manner for the Christian to live. "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world." *Verses 11, 12*. Now what is the incentive which he sets forth for following such a course of life? "Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." *Verses 13*. The apostle James makes the same point, when he exhorts us to be patient unto the coming of the Lord. *James 5:7*. Then he cites the case of the husbandman who deposits seed in the ground, and then waits patiently. Why does he have patience? Because he expects in due season to reap the

precious fruits of the earth. And the apostle concludes: "Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." *James 5:8*. The ground of the Christian's patience is the expectation that Christ will come to crown him with immortal glory. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.22*

And this is why that hope is termed a blessed hope. "If I go and prepare a place for you," says Christ, "I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am there ye may be also." *John 14:3*. There can be no blessedness equal to being with Christ. So the disciples thought, as they were filled with sorrow at the thought of his leaving them. But he promised to come and take them to be with him, and that coming was afterward the object of their longings. It was the one hope that brightened life. What a happy reunion that will be when the disciples once more gather around their beloved Lord. How their hearts must have thrilled at the prospect. "Happy" means "blessed;" and so it was very natural to call the hope of Christ's coming a "blessed hope." *SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.23*

But how is it that the Lord will take his disciples to be with him? Not only the twelve, but hosts of other disciples just as true as they, have died. Compared with the multitude of the faithful that have lived on the earth, those who will be alive at Christ's coming will be very few in number. We have learned in *Matthew 24:31* that when the Lord comes "he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other;" but who will be gathered? Let Paul answer: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." *1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17. SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.24*

This tells the story. Who of Christ's followers will be taken when he comes? All; both living and dead. Did the living have any precedence? No; they "shall not prevent [go before] them which are asleep." But when the Lord descends with a shout and a trumpet

sound, the graves are shaken open, and the dead in Christ rise. This is the first thing. *Then* the living will be taken, not one year or six thousand years later, but they shall be caught up then, *together with them* (the dead), to meet the Lord. And by this means, says Paul, shall we ever be with the Lord. The apostle is now concerned only to give a sure basis for comfort to those persons whose pious friends had died, hence the case of the wicked does not come into his mind; he says nothing about them. We may learn their fate from other texts. But in this text nothing is taught more clearly than that the disciples of Christ get to be with him only by translation and resurrection, and that both the events take place at the same time, namely, at his coming. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.25*

The opinions of learned and pious men always have weight on a subject of this kind, so we quote from Dr. Barnes on this text. The testimony which he gives is all the more strong because the logical conclusion from it is directly the opposite of what he himself believed. He held that the righteous go to be with Christ as soon as they die, yet he did not let his prejudices bias his mind from the plain meaning of this text. He says:-*SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.26*

“We have in the passage before us an interesting view of the *order* in which these great events will occur. There will be (1) the descent of the Judge with the attending host of Heaven; (2) the raising of the righteous dead; (3) the change which the living will undergo (comp. *1 Corinthians 15:52*); (4) the ascent to meet the Lord in the air; and (5) the return with him to glory. What place in this series of wonders will be assigned for the resurrection of the *wicked*, is not mentioned here. The object of the apostle did not lead him to advert to that, since its purpose was to comfort the afflicted Christians by the assurance that their pious friends would rise again, and would suffer no disadvantage by the fact that they had died before the coming of the Redeemer.” *SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.27*

Our Saviour set before his disciples no other prospect of reward but at his coming. “When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, neither thy kinsmen, nor thy rich neighbours; lest they also bid thee again, and a recompense be made thee. But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the

maimed, the lame, the blind; and thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just.” *Luke 14:12-14*. When does the resurrection take place? Paul, in *1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17*, above quoted, says that it is when the Lord himself comes from heaven, and the trump of God sounds. Now Christ knew that those to whom he was talking would not live till his coming; why then did he not tell them to look to the time of their death for their reward? Why did he direct their attention to some point far beyond? Simply because death is not the time when rewards are distributed. If it were, the Lord would have said so. Instead of promising to reward the faithful ones at death, he said: “And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day.” *John 6:40*. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.28*

When Paul was brought before Agrippa (see *Acts 26:1, 6, 7*) he said: “And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers; unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope’s sake, king Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews.” From the following verse, “Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?” We would naturally infer that the resurrection was the thing promised to the fathers, and the “hope,” for which Paul was accused. That this inference is correct we learn from *Acts 23:6*, where it is recorded that on a similar occasion, but a short time before, and while under the same accusation, Paul said: “Of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question.” *SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.29*

The interesting question now arises, How could Paul say that he was called in question for holding the hope of a resurrection of the dead, when none of his accusers had said one word about the resurrection? The answer is, that he was brought to trial on account of his belief in Christ. It was because of this teaching that Christ was the Son of God, and for the vigorous advocacy of his doctrines, and especially for teaching that Christ had risen from the dead, that Paul was apprehended. Now the resurrection of the dead depends upon the resurrection of Christ. His resurrection is the pledge of the general resurrection. Christ says: “I am he that liveth, and was

dead; and behold I am all live forevermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death.” *Revelation 1:18*. He gained the keys of the grave when he went into it and came out a conqueror. Having gained them, he will use them to unlock the prison doors and liberate the captives that death has made. In support of this we have his own words: “Because I live, ye shall live also.” *John 14:19*. And this statement, it will be noticed, was made immediately after his promise to come and take his disciples to himself. So then to deny the resurrection of Christ, as the Jews were doing, was equivalent to denying the general resurrection. And conversely, Paul says in *1 Corinthians 15:13-16*, that to deny the general resurrection is to deny the resurrection of Christ. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.30*

Again; if the Jews were persecuting Paul for his belief in the resurrection, how could he say that the twelve tribes were longing for the hope of the promise? The promise made to the fathers was the inheritance of the world. *Romans 4:13*. This was made to Abraham, to Isaac, and Jacob. But we learn that “these all died in faith, by having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth.” *Hebrews 11:13*. This proves that they did not expect to have the promises fulfilled in this life; that the promise of God included the resurrection, and that they so understood it. If it were not so, they would have died in disappointment, and not in faith. Now the Jews looked for this inheritance that was promised to the fathers, and longed for it, but in their short-sided rejection of Christ, they were turning away from the only thing that could give them a share in it. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 502.31*

That Abraham believed in the resurrection of the dead, we have positive proof. Paul says: “By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac; and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten son. Of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called; accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure.” *Hebrews 11:17-19*. That which made it possible for the patriarch to offer up his only son, through whom alone the promise could be fulfilled, was his belief that God would raise him from the dead in

order to perform his promise to make of him a great nation. But how did Abraham get such an idea? From God himself. He knew that the promise contemplated a resurrection in order that the multitude of his faithful descendants might be partakers in it; and he accounted that if God would raise all the faithful at the last day, he was able to raise the single individual upon whom the existence of those faithful ones depended. And if Abraham, to whom the promises were made, understood that the resurrection was necessary to their accomplishments, we would naturally expect that all the “fathers” would have correct ideas on the subject. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 503.1*

The fate of the wicked does not come within the scope of this lesson, yet the simple fact is told that they also will be raised. That is what we would be led to expect from the fact that the rewards are not given at death. Every man must receive according to the things he has done, but if the wicked have no resurrection, this cannot be. Paul’s hope included this as well as the resurrection of the righteous. We quote his words: “But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets; and have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.” *Acts 24:14, 15*. Add to this our Saviour’s words in *John 5:28, 29*: “Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation,” and we have all the testimony that reasonable beings can desire. There are some who affect to believe that none but the righteous will have a resurrection; but to hold such a theory is to deny and throw contempt upon the positive statements of both Christ and Paul. E. J. W. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 503.2*

“The Resurrection” The Signs of the Times, 10, 32.

E. J. Waggoner

In the preceding articles concerning the coming of the Lord, we have learned that he will certainly come, that his coming will be

manifest to all, that it is for the purpose of receiving all his disciples to themselves, and that this is accomplished by the resurrection of the dead and the translation of the living. One or two more texts on the subject of that resurrection will be sufficient. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 505.1*

When Job was suffering the deepest affliction, and at the point of death, he asked: "If a man die, will he live again?" This was a very pertinent question for a man in his situation. Notice the form of the question: Not, "Shall he *continue* to live?" But, "Shall he live *again*?" This expression shows clearly that Job made a plain distinction between life and death. "Again" signifies "another time," and indicates that an interval of time has elapsed since the same thing occurred or existed before. Job anticipated a time in which there would be no life, in which he would not exist, and he asked whether life would ever be restored. But he asked the question only to answer it, for he immediately added: "All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come. Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee; thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hands." *Job 14:14, 15. SITI August 21, 1884, page 505.2*

Now we may ask, When will the Lord call and be answered by those who are dead? Christ himself furnishes the answer: "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." *John 5:26-29*. And David says that it is at his coming that the Lord calls to his people. *Psalms 50:3, 4. SITI August 21, 1884, page 505.3*

Isaiah said, in prophetic vision, saw the end of the world, and the coming of the Lord. Speaking of the triumph of the righteous, he said: "He [the Lord] will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it." *Isaiah 25:8*. If the Lord has spoken it, it must be done. Paul tells how and when it will be done: "Behold, I show you a

mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.” *1 Corinthians 15:51, 52.SITI August 21, 1884, page 505.4*

Here, then, is the “change” of which Job spoke. It is a change from death to life, from mortal to immortal. And in what state did Job expect to be until this change should come? In death, for it was that of which he was speaking. The apostle also says that the dead as well as the living are to be changed. And here we find death called a sleep. We shall not all *sleep*, but both dead and living shall be changed. “For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, *then* shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory.” *1 Corinthians 15:53, 54.* Death is not swallowed up in victory till Christ comes. The saints do not shout, “O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?” until the voice of the Son of God calls them forth from their tombs. And what does this prove? That death and the grave have for a time triumph, and held them captives. If it were not so, if the saints had passed to death immediately to a state of the eternal bliss, they would not be obliged to wait until the coming of the Lord to shout their victory. They could at once voice their contempt for its weakness; or, more consistently, they could ascribe to it thanksgiving and praise for having liberated them from the toils of earth, and ushered them into the joys of Heaven.*SITI August 21, 1884, page 505.5*

Now we ask, What is the necessity for a resurrection of the dead? If the faithful of past ages are now “safe in the arms of Jesus,” as is so often taught and sung, what more can they need? Of what benefit to them will the resurrection be? None at all. The Bible doctrine of the resurrection is directly opposed to the theory that men are taken to Heaven at death. The Bible writers rested their entire hope in a resurrection; and this proves that they had no idea of the possibility (since they must die) of being with Christ in any other way.*SITI August 21, 1884, page 505.6*

Paul said that he counted all things loss for Christ, and for him gave up everything, and was willing to know the “fellowship of his sufferings,” and be “made conformable under his death.” And what for? “If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.” *Philippians 3:11*. Why did he esteem it so all-important to attain unto the resurrection of the dead? Let him answer: “If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not?” *1 Corinthians 15:32*. He had no hope in anything else. Let him once be convinced that the dead would not rise, and all incentive to action would have been taken away from one of the most tireless and zealous men that ever lived. Surely, then, the resurrection is a doctrine of no small importance. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 505.7*

In order to try to harmonize the doctrine of a final resurrection with the theory that the spirits of the good are taken to Heaven immediately upon the death of the body, it is claimed that they do not receive the fullness of their reward until the resurrection. But this theory is overthrown by Paul’s words: “What advantageth it me, if the dead rise not?” Is it nothing to be in the presence of God and Christ and the angels? Is it nothing to be exempt from pain, and free from the assaults of Satan? Certainly to gain such a state, even if it were not the fullness of joy, is worth a great deal of effort. Paul’s words show that he had no knowledge of any benefit that would accrue to the dead except through the resurrection. And if he taught men to place all their hopes in the coming of the Lord and the resurrection, who shall dare to teach otherwise? If he did not know the exact truth in regard to the matter, to whom has a later revelation been made? So true are all the words of Paul that even an angel from heaven would bring a curse upon himself if he should teach anything different. *Galatians 1:8. SITI August 21, 1884, page 505.8*

In view of the testimony that has been quoted to show that the resurrection takes place at the coming of the Lord, it is hardly worth while to notice the position that it is at death; that the rising of the soul or spirit from the body is the resurrection. This theory makes the saints be with the Lord at death, and thus makes death to be the coming of the Lord, which we have seen is a false and absurd position. There were some in Paul’s day who taught that the

resurrection was past, and he said that they had erred concerning the truth, and were overthrowing the faith of some. *2 Timothy 2:18*. Nothing could more surely overthrow faith than such teaching, for who that accepted it could have any belief in the promises of a future second coming of Christ? It is as impossible to harmonize the theory of the past resurrection, or a resurrection at death, with the doctrine of the second coming of Christ, as to mix oil with water. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 505.9*

In closing, we will call attention to *Revelation 22:4-6*. John says: "I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God.... and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." "Ah," says one, "that is what I believe; the souls of the martyrs went at once to live with Christ." Let us see; these are not all the dead that John saw. He continues: "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power." Now notice: "The rest of the dead lived not *again* until the thousand years were finished." Then the dead that John first saw were living *again*. And if living again, this must be the second life, which is separated from the first by an interval called death. Then death and life are not the same. And this "living again," after an interval, is called a resurrection. Then what is the resurrection? It is the "living again" of those who have been dead, and not the continued existence of something that has never died. Those who do not have part in the first resurrection, do not "live again" until the thousand years are finished. Then they have a resurrection. Now allowing that "the rest of the dead" died at the very beginning of the thousand years, and we have their death and their resurrection separated by a period of a thousand years. That does not look like a resurrection at death. E. J. W. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 505.10*

"Relation of the Law and Grace" The Signs of the Times, 10, 32.

E. J. Waggoner

[A sermon delivered in the tent at Oakland, Cal., Aug. 5, 1884.] *SITI August 21, 1884, page 505.11*

The subject of this evening is a question which is prefaced by the following text of Scripture, quoted from the Emphatic Diaglott:-*SITI August 21, 1884, page 505.12*

“Galatians 5:4. ‘Whosoever of you are justifying yourselves by law are separated from Christ; you are fallen off from the favor of God. My question is this: Was not the Mosaic law written on stone, given alone to the Jews?’”SITI August 21, 1884, page 505.13

Accompanying this question is a letter giving the position of the questioner, some points of which I will notice. In contrast with the Jews, he says of us: “We who are begotten of the Spirit through the belief of the truth are become new (spiritual) creatures in Christ, and are raised spiritual bodies, like unto his glorious body, for there is a natural body and there is a spiritual body.”*SITI August 21, 1884, page 505.14*

This remark contains a very grave error. The “spiritual body” is given in the resurrection. See *1 Corinthians 15*. The Christian is spiritually minded, but has yet a natural, corruptible body, being subject to decay, which the spiritual body will not be. Again he says: “He who undertakes to do the deeds of the law has fallen from grace, as say the Scriptures.” If this assertion be true, I have been in fault in my reading, for I never read any such thing in the Bible. And the Bible has no such saying.*SITI August 21, 1884, page 505.15*

In regard to justification, we have distinctly avowed in this tent that we do not expect it by the law. If there is anybody who seeks or expects to be justified by the law, to him the question will apply: to him this text stands as a reproof. Paul says in *Romans 3* that the justification which we receive through faith in Christ, without works, is “for the remission of sins that are past.” But he does not say we can live godly lives, and build up a moral character without works. He exhorts to “work out your own salvation with fear and trembling;” *Philippians 2:12*; for every man will be judged and rewarded according to his works. *Revelation 22:12; Matthew 16:27*. I have before said, in this tent, that all our obedience, our tears, our confessions, our prayers, our repentance, will never remove a single sin we have committed. Remission of past sin is by the blood

of Christ through faith alone; not by works at all. But as to the future, when we form character it must be by obedience; then “faith without works is dead.” It is lifeless, formal, useless.*SITI August 21, 1884, page 505.16*

As to the expression, “a new creature,” it does not mean another creature. But the “old man” of sin is destroyed. All things-sinful things, worldliness, etc.-have passed away; but the law of God has not passed away. Mark, the change must all be in man; not in God, nor in his government. Rebellion, sin, does not change God’s law, nor does it create the necessity of a change in God’s law. It changes our relation to the law, bringing us in opposition to it; and it makes necessary another change in us, a change from sin to obedience; and this is also wrought by faith in Christ, who strengthens us to overcome our sins, and walk in obedience to his Father.*SITI August 21, 1884, page 505.17*

I am also requested, in this connection, to notice *Romans 10:4*. It reads thus: “For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness, to every one that believeth.” There are three points to be noticed in this text.*SITI August 21, 1884, page 506.1*

1. In what sense is Christ the end of the law? Not in the sense of abolishing the law, for if that were the meaning, it would apply to all, both to the believer and the unbeliever. If it means the abolition of the law, then we have the anomalous relation of a law abolished to one class, and not to another class. And not only that, but it is abolished to numerous individuals at one period in the experience of each one, and not abolished at another period in his experience! The word end must be used as in *James 5:11*: “Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord.” Not the abolition of the Lord. End, in both these texts, means the object or intention. Paul says the law was ordained unto life; it was designed to guide people in obedience to their Creator, that they might live. For to disobey, to sin, is death. Since we are all sinners, and we can no longer obtain life by the law, Christ comes in and meets the design or the end of the law and gives us life.*SITI August 21, 1884, page 506.2*

2. This is “for righteousness.” We may learn what righteousness is

by the inspired definitions given by John. "Unrighteousness is sin," and "sin is the transgression of the law." *1 John 5:17; 3:4*. Now if unrighteousness is the transgression of the law, righteousness is obedience to the law. "He that doeth righteousness is righteous." *1 John 3:7*. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 506.3*

3. "To every one that believeth." In the unbeliever the object of the law is not accomplished, for he, as Paul says, has "pleasure in unrighteousness." *2 Thessalonians 2:12*. This text does not teach that the law is no longer of obligation, but it does teach that we are to obey the law through faith in Christ. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 506.4*

The question itself, whether the law was given to the Gentiles or the Jews alone, is quickly disposed of. Was there ever a time when it was no sin in the Gentiles to worship idols, to blaspheme the name of God, to dishonor their parents, to kill, to commit adultery, and to steal? If there is any force to the question, if it has any bearing against our position, it is only because these things were not wrong in the Gentiles. But if these things were sin in the Gentiles-if for these abominations God abhorred the Gentiles-then the law held them, for "where no law is there is no transgression," and "sin is not imputed when there is no law." *Romans 4:15; 5:13*. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 506.5*

This sufficiently refutes the idea which appears to be in the mind of the questioner, as far as the Gentiles are concerned as a class. But the question has a more specific application, not to Gentiles at large, but to the believers in Christ from the Gentiles. What we have before said, especially on *Romans 10:4*, is to this point; but it must be noticed more particularly. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 506.6*

Paul says more on the subject of justification than all other writers of the Bible; and he says more about it, argues it more particularly, in the letter to the Romans, than in all his other writings together. And it is a suggestive fact that the first time he speaks of *justify* in this letter is in connection with doing the law, while he has never connected, in any man, justification and breaking the law. He never recognizes any such relation. *Romans 2:13* says: "The doers of the law shall be justified." An objector once said to me, when I quoted

that text, "You, then, believe in justification by the law: but I would not like to risk my salvation on your word on that subject." I replied. 1. You have not my word on the subject. I quoted Paul's words, and if you have any fault.... 2. *You* have nothing... text, for Paul was not there speaking..., or of any like you. He said the doers of the law; but you are not a doer of the law; indeed, you disclaim any intention to do the law. Therefore you have no claim, and personally no interest in that text. But the text is useful in this: It teaches that justification is in the law, and we would find it there if we had not forfeited it; if we had not transgressed the law. It is a vindication of the morality of the law, and it fully agrees with Solomon's words, that to keep God's commandments "is the whole duty of man." And if man had done his whole duty, if he had never sinned, he would not be condemned; he must then be justified. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 506.7*

Some affect to find a contradiction between this text and *Romans 3:20*, which says: "By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified." But there is no contradiction. It may be said that both cannot be true absolutely; one must be qualified to avoid the contradiction. Which shall it be? And the answer generally comes thus: "The first must be qualified, for it is an absolute fact that no one can be justified by the law." But this answer is made under a misapprehension of the facts, and of the principles underlying them. There is an intermediate statement which makes all plain: let us take the three in connection-they are given in the regular form of an argument: 1. The doers of the law shall be justified. 2. There are no doers; all have gone astray: "there is none that doeth good, no, not one." 3. Conclusion: "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified." Thus we see that it is no fault of the law that it does not justify us; it is our own fault; we are sinners and the law would be unworthy of respect as a law if it would justify us. We deserve condemnation, and the law very properly treats us as we deserve. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 506.8*

And then another query is raised. "What is the use," it is asked, "of keeping a law which will not justify us?" But this question shows an unenviable state of mind on the part of the questioner. We should not view the subject altogether in the light of its benefit to ourselves: something is due to the Government of God; his authority is to be

recognized, his law to be honored. But if it is necessary to our salvation that past sin should be forgiven, it is equally necessary that future sin shall be prevented. Sin is odious in the sight of God, whether it be past, present, or future. Obedience is better than sacrifice. If all shall be rewarded according to their works, how necessary that our works should conform to the divine will, which we learn only in his law. See *Romans 2:17-23*. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 506.9*

To illustrate this let me relate an incident. It is not “founded on fact;” it is the fact itself. Some years ago I was preaching in Wisconsin, and a man gravely informed me that he had learned that we are not justified by the law. I replied that we had learned the same thing; that we did not expect to be justified by the law; the law had no power to justify a sinner, and we did not keep it with the thought of being justified by it. And he then began to laugh. Being inquired of for the reason, he said he could not help laughing that anybody should be fool enough to keep a law which cannot justify him. Laying the compliment aside, I proposed to present the case in such a manner that he could appreciate it. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 506.10*

Suppose you were accused of stealing a horse, and were proved guilty, and the Judge thereupon asks if you have anything to say, and you ask and are answered as follows: “Judge, will the law of Wisconsin justify me?” “Justify you? No; we have not a law in Wisconsin that will justify a man stealing horses? The law condemns you, and I am about to pronounce its sentence upon you?” “Well, Judge, I am not such a fool as to keep a law which will not justify me, and hereafter I intend to steal all the horses that I can.” “And,” says the Judge, “I will see that you do not have the opportunity very soon to carry your intention into effect, for I shall give you the full time in prison which the law allows.” And then I inquired: “Do you not think the Judge would so answer a man who avowed such an intention?” He answered, “Yes,” and added, “But nobody would be foolish enough to talk like that! “Of course not; nobody would be foolish enough to treat the law of the State in that manner; but that is exactly the manner in which you have been treating the law of God. If you, and people in general, would grant as much to the law of God as you require for the law of the State,

we would have little need to argue the question. No one ever for one moment supposes that a pardon frees any one from obligation to keep the law of the State which condemns him. But there are thousands who refuse to keep the law of God because Jesus Christ has purchased their pardon by his blood!" *SITI August 21, 1884, page 506.11*

Satan is wily, we know; but it is a marvel that he can so blind the minds of people who appear to be otherwise sensible, as to make them believe that pardon absolves them from allegiance to God and his law! Paul says that "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law." *Galatians 3:13*. But the curse comes only by transgression. Had man not sinned, he would not have been cursed, for "the doers of the law shall be justified." And the curse invariably, in all cases, follows transgression. Christ redeems from the curse, but not from the duty; he redeems from the condemnation, but not from the obligation. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 506.12*

We say that the curse follows transgression "in all cases," because it is as true now that "the wages of sin is death," as it was before Christ died, or would have been if Christ had never died. It is a narrow view of the method of redemption which leads one to say that obedience to the law is contrary to free grace. And this calls us to notice one more point in the position of the questioner. It is his claim on *Romans 6:14*: "Ye are not under the law, but under grace." *SITI August 21, 1884, page 506.13*

But this is only a part of the text. Taken in its connection it clearly teaches that we are not under the law in the sense of being under its condemnation; from this we are released by grace. But it does not teach that we are free from obligation to the law; to the contrary, it teaches that violation of the law is contrary to grace. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 506.14*

Here are two individuals, one a non-professor, and the other a church member, who claim to be released from the obligation of the law. We can more readily represent the position of the latter (which is the position of our questioner) by the way of question and answer. "What is your position?" "I am not under the law, but under

grace.” “Were you always under grace?” “No; I was by nature a child of wrath, even as others.” “When did you come under grace?” “When I was converted.” “Then under grace is the condition of a converted man. What was your condition before you were converted, and what is the condition of all the unconverted world?” “Under the law, of course.” “Very well; are they who are under the law condemned by the law if they break it?” “Certainly; they are under its curse, as sinners.” “But if the law has power to curse them-if they are under it-then the law cannot be abolished; it is still in force?” “No, it cannot be abolished, but I am free from it through faith in Christ.” “Are you, then, free from all its claims, so that you are not obliged to keep it?” “I am not under the law; I am entirely free from it, and it has no authority over me.” “But when you were under the law you were under obligation to keep it, and therefore it was sin in you to transgress it. Then we are to conclude that it was sin in you to break the law before you were converted, but it is not sin in you to break the law after you were converted. Is that so?” “Why, there is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus?” “We will waive for the present the subject of forgiveness, or justification. But we must conclude from your declarations that that which is sinful in an unconverted man, is no sin in a converted man!” *SITI August 21, 1884, page 506.15*

This is the doctrine of the old “perfectionists”—a doctrine which we had hoped had disappeared from the face of the earth. According to this doctrine, if a man feels the restraints of the law and wishes to break it, but dare not for fear of condemnation, he has only to be converted and join the church, and he is at once at full liberty to violate the law! This is making “Christ the minister of sin.” *Galatians 2:17*. The way of righteousness is not found in such a sham Christianity as this. *SITI August 21, 1884, page 507.1*

Look again at these two men. One professes to be a Christian, and the other is an acknowledged sinner. How do we know that he is a sinner? Because he transgresses the law (*1 John 3:4*), for by the law is the knowledge of sin (*Romans 3:20*). What, then, is the difference between him and the other man? Oh! this other man is a Christian. But neither does he keep the law; he claims that he is not under its obligation. So, then, one breaks the law, and he is therefore a sinner; the other breaks the law also, yet he is a

Christian! And the only real difference between them is that one professes religion and has his name on the church book! Both are sinners according to every authorized definition of sin.*SITI August 21, 1884, page 507.2*

We have here a subject worthy of our earnest consideration. It cannot be too strongly enforced. The idea of the objector is that the law is not now binding; that we are released from its authority by grace. But if that be so, then there is no distinction of classes, for none can be under an abolished law in any sense, and all are under grace. That will answer for Universalists, but Paul says: "For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace." Therefore his words will not apply to all the world, but to those only who are not under the dominion of sin. But as long as we transgress the law, so long has sin dominion over us. Sin brings condemnation, no matter when or where it is found. And therefore the apostle's question and answer in the next verses: "What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the law but under grace? God forbid. Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?" This is a plain declaration that if we sin, or violate the law, after we are justified, or under grace, we again come under the dominion of sin, and the result is death. And the same is shown in the first verses of the chapter. "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" Some say we shall; they affirm that we deny grace if we keep the law, or abstain from sin. But the apostle says, "God forbid;" and he continues; "How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?" Here is an important lesson. That we are dead is proved by our having been buried-in baptism. Dead to what? to sin. But if we live in it-if we still transgress the law-we are not dead to it. Then we are not under grace, but under the law-under condemnation.*SITI August 21, 1884, page 507.3*

That there is a popular prejudice against preaching the law, we are well aware. And we regret that preachers themselves are strengthening this prejudice by conforming to the popular feeling, and moving in this popular current. I was once requested to put

away exclusiveness and unite with another in holding revival meetings; and was told that I must not talk so much about the law; that people did not want to hear it! Now I believe in union as much as any do, and am willing to unite on the same terms that they require. They will unite with me if I will yield my faith and adopt theirs. And, in like manner, I am ready to unite with everybody who will yield the peculiarities of his faith and adopt mine. I am just as liberal as they are. But my inquiry was this: If I drop the law, what shall I preach? "Why, preach repentance; nobody has any prejudice against that." What an idea, that the minister must conform his preaching to people's prejudices. But, if somebody asks me of what he shall repent, what reply shall I give? "Tell him, of course, to repent of sin." Just so; and then if he asks me what is sin, what shall I say? In a hesitating manner he replied: "Why, the apostle says, sin is the transgression of the law." But I thought you were going to set me on a track to get rid of the law, and you have me in the same difficulty still, and yet you tell me I must not preach the law. It thus appears that you think the law is not of sufficient consequence to be preached. But if the law is of no consequence, the transgression of it is of no consequence; and if sin is of no consequence, repentance is of no consequence; and if repentance is of no consequence, then your preaching is of no consequence! This is the logical result of depreciating the law. With such preaching I have no desire to unite.*SITI August 21, 1884, page 507.4*

We believe that the great God is displeased with this easy style of religion which ignores his law which he has so highly honored. It is made void by preachers and by people. Either in whole or in part it is set aside bodily, publicly. And yet the Lord has shown that he who offends in one is guilty of all, for the law is a unit; if we break one commandment we are law-breakers, doers of iniquity. Men will even profess "holiness," entire freedom from sin, and yet transgress the law continually! What definition of sin will they give us? By what rule shall we be made to believe that God approves their course? How shall we determine that their religion is genuine, and not rank fanaticism?*SITI August 21, 1884, page 507.5*

We have a message, which says: "Here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Paul says that we

do not make void the law through faith. *Romans 3:31*. They are united in true moral and Christian character. And before our High Priest closes his work, there must be a reform; the commandments of God must be honored, and kept, even as the faith of Jesus.*SITI August 21, 1884, page 507.6*

August 28, 1884

“The Sabbath-School” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—SEPT. 20

1. Shortly after the birth of Christ, what cruel act did Herod perform?
Matthew 2:16.SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.1

2. What prophets had foretold this event, and its attendant sorrow?
Verses 17, 18.SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.2

3. Where is this prophecy found? *Jeremiah 31:15.SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.3*

4. What did the Lord, through his prophet, say to the sorrowing mothers? *Verse 16.SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.4*

5. From what place is it said that the murdered children shall come?
Ib.SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.5

6. What is found in Heaven, in the presence of God? *Psalms 16:11.SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.6*

7. Since the murdered children are now in the land of the enemy, can it be that they went to Heaven at death? *SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.7*

8. Who is the enemy of the human race? *1 Peter 5:8.SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.8*

9. Do all who died pass under Satan’s power? *Hebrews 2:14.SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.9*

10. Who has the keys of Satan’s prison house? *Revelation 1:18.SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.10*

11. By whom is the resurrection of the dead made possible? *Acts 4:2; 1 Corinthians 15:22.SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.11*

12. What has the Lord promised to do with death? *Isaiah 25:8.SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.12*

13. When will this thing be brought to pass? *1 Corinthians 15:54.SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.13*

14. What is the change that shall take place when this same shall be brought to pass?*SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.14*

15. When does this change from corruption to incorruption take place? *1 Corinthians 15:51-53.SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.15*

16. And when is it that the trumpet sounds? *1 Thessalonians 4:16.SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.16*

17. Then when is it that God's people gain the victory over death?*SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.17*

18. When will they come from the land of the enemy?*SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.18*

19. Quote two Scriptures to show that both living and dead are made immortal at the same time.*SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.19*

Our lesson this week is introduced by an incident which is familiar to everyone having the slightest knowledge of the Bible, namely, the slaughter of the children at Bethlehem, by order of Herod, improperly called "The Great." Whether many or few infants were slain, the act is one of unparalleled atrocity; for although it was perfectly in keeping with Herod's character, his life having been filled with the murders, we know of no other instance on record, of a wholesale massacre of *infants*, in order to secure the destruction of a possible future claimant of the crown. As to the effect that this barbarous act caused, the evangelist has simply said that there was "lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning." Each mind can best picture for itself the anguish and sorrow that followed.*SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.20*

The point, however, to which we are directed is the fact that this was a direct fulfillment of a prophecy uttered by Jeremiah fully six hundred years before, and recorded in his *31st chapter*. Many

commentators have thought that Matthew merely states a striking coincidence which he had discovered between the words of Jeremiah, spoken with reference to another object, and the occurrence at the birth of Christ. But a large part of prophecy has a double meaning; that is, two similar things, while near it hand and the other far distant, maybe foretold in the same words. And so Jeremiah's prophecy, although it had immediate reference to the Jewish captivity and restoration, took in also this and other calamities, and the final restoration of God's people. The fact that the prophet had in view the captivity of the Jews, adds force to the argument which we draw from his words, as we shall see.*SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.21*

"Thus saith the Lord; A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation, and bitter weeping; Rachel weeping for her children refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not. Thus saith the Lord; refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears: for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the Lord; and they shall come again from the land of the enemy." *Jeremiah 31:15, 16*. Now notice: These children "were not," that is, they were dead; they had ceased to exist. Again, the command is given, "Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears." This is advice that we have more than once heard given to sorrowing mothers; but the reason for so doing was not the same as that given by the Lord through his prophet. Modern comforters bid the mother to cease weeping, because her child is now happy in Heaven, singing praises before the throne of God, etc. But the Lord gives as a source of comfort the fact that the children shall come again from the *land of the enemy*. Is Heaven the land of the enemy? No one would think of applying to it such a title as that. It is the habitation of God (*Psalms 11:4; 33:13, 14*), and certainly he cannot be called an enemy. The psalmist, addressing God, says: "In thy presence is fullness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures forevermore." *Psalms 16:11*. Then certainly those little ones had not gone the heaven. And if they did not go to Heaven at death, who does? for surely they had done no sin, and that there was hope for them is plainly stated by the Lord.*SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.22*

Where, then, did they go? To the land of the enemy, for that is the place from which they are to come again to their own border. Our

first inquiry must be as to who is the enemy. Peter says: "Be sober, be vigilant; because your *adversary the devil*, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." *1 Peter 5:8*. An adversary is "an antagonist; an enemy; a foe." He is the enemy not only of the whole human race, but of God. "But," some one may ask, in astonishment, "why should those innocent children go to the land of the devil? What wrong had they done?" Not so fast; let us see what the land of the enemy is. These children were dead; concerning that there is no disagreement. Now death is often spoken of as a land. Job says: "Are not my days few? cease then, and let me alone, that I may take comfort a little, before I go whence I shall not return, even to the land of darkness and the shadow of death; a land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness." *Job 10:20-22*. And David says: "Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? shall the dead arise and praise thee? Selah. Shall thy lovingkindness be declared in the grave? or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" *Psalms 88:10-12*. Thus we see that death is spoken of as a land, and that the devil is an enemy; let us see if we have Scripture warranted for connecting the two. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.23*

We turn to the second chapter of Hebrews, and there we read: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he Christ also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." *Verse 14*. Death, then, is under the control of Satan, and is, therefore, the land of the enemy. All who die pass into the enemy's land, and under the power of the enemy. And now we see the appropriateness of applying Jeremiah's prophecy to the slaughter of the innocents as well as to the captivity of the Jews. The Israelites were taken to Babylon, the land of their enemy and conqueror. They did not desire to go, and it was not a pleasant place for them while there. (See *Psalms 137*.) They felt that they were in an enemy's land. Now if death be a friend, as it is often called, there is no fitness in applying a prophecy concerning the Jews' captivity to the murder of the children. But when we remember that death is an enemy (*1 Corinthians 15:26*), and that the adversary of the race has control of it (*Hebrews 2:14*), we see perfect harmony in the double

application of the prophecy. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.24*

In the light of *Hebrews 2:14*, which says that the devil has the power of death, let us consider for a moment the theory that death ushers the good into the presence of God. The old hymn has it that death is “the voice that Jesus sends, to call us to his arms.” If that be so, then the devil is Christ’s messenger to call his children home. And in that case the devil would cease to be the adversary of mankind, for no kindlier act could be performed than to admit us to the joys of Heaven. Indeed many persons do, although unconscious of the fact, call the devil a friend; for they call death a friend; and if death be a friend, then the one who has control of it and brings it to us must also be a friend. We do not care to thus compliment the devil, and we believe that no one else will who gives the matter serious thought. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.25*

Death is Satan’s prison house. Were he allowed to have his own way, he would never release one of its captives. But Christ says: “I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive forevermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell the grave and death.” *Revelation 1:18*. Satan can still shut up mortals in the grave, but he cannot hold them there. Christ has entered the strong man’s house, and having proved himself the stronger, will spoil him of his goods. It is through Christ that the resurrection of the dead comes. It is he, not Satan, that admits the righteous into the mansions prepared for them. He has promised (*Isaiah 25:8*) to swallow up death in victory, and this will be brought to pass, not at death, but when the trumpet sounds, and the dead in Christ are raised incorruptible, and the living are changed. If anyone thinks that death has been swallowed up in victory, let him consider whether the living have been changed to immortality. When that takes place, there will be no more sorrow, nor crying, nor pain, for then we shall ever be with the Lord. E. J. W. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 518.26*

“Under the Law” The Signs of the Times, 10, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

There is no text that is more frequently called into service by those who teach the abolition of God’s law than *Romans 6:14*: “For ye are

not under the law, but under grace.” It can hardly be said however that *Romans 6:14* is called into the service, for the whole of the text is seldom given, neither is the context quoted by the opposers of God’s law; and we are sorry to say that many forget even to tell where the little that they do quote may be found, thus rendering it impossible for those unfamiliar with the Bible to examine the matter for themselves. We shall endeavor to set forth the exact meaning of the expression, letting the Bible be its own expositor.*SITI August 28, 1884, page 520.1*

Before entering upon the study of a disputed text it is always well, if possible, to have some definite statements concerning the point in question. Fortunately, on the subject of the law, the Bible is not lacking in explicit statements. We will quote a few in addition to those previously noticed in these articles. Christ said: “Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.” *Matthew 5:17, 18*. But all has not yet been fulfilled. The Lord, through Isaiah, said: “Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth.” *Isaiah 65:17*. This prophecy has not yet been accomplished, therefore, according to our Saviour’s words, the law has not yet passed away. And to show still more plainly the immutable nature of that law, he said: “And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail.” *Luke 16:17*.*SITI August 28, 1884, page 520.2*

The words of Christ recorded in *Matthew 7:21* bear directly on the text under consideration. It is claimed that *Romans 6:14* teaches that Christians are not required to keep the law. But Christ said: “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven.” This covers all who will enter Heaven, of whatever class or nation they may be. Calling on the name of the Lord is not sufficient; only those will enter Heaven who have done the will of God. Then certainly the law is binding on Christians.*SITI August 28, 1884, page 520.3*

Again; as we have already seen, the law is God’s righteousness: My tongue shall speak of thy word; for all thy commandments are

righteousness.” *Psalm 119:172*. Verse 142 reads: “Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and thy law is the truth.” Here we have the two facts stated, that the law is righteousness, and that it is everlasting. In *Isaiah 51:7* the Lord says: “Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law.” This again shows that the law of God is righteousness; and the preceding verse says: “My righteousness shall not be abolished.” Of course not; who can suppose for a moment that God would abolish righteousness? No one would charge him with doing such a thing, yet that is just what he would be doing if he should abolish his law. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 520.4*

Now we are prepared to consider *Romans 6:14*: “Ye are not under the law, but under grace.” Who are they that are not under the law? Those who are under grace. Now Paul says, “By grace are ye saved,” *Ephesians 2:5*; so, then, those, and those only, who are under grace will be saved in the kingdom of God. But we have already seen from our Saviour’s words in *Matthew 5:7-21*, that only those are saved who do the will, or law, of God. Then it necessarily follows that they who are under grace are the very ones who keep God’s law; and therefore the apostle does not mean that we are not obliged to keep the law, when he says we are not under it but under grace. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 520.5*

If we examine the context, we shall find this conclusion confirmed. Going back to the previous chapter, we find the statement that “where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.” The grace of God was extensive enough to cover all sin. The apostle then continues: “What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?” *Romans 6:1*. The idea is, Since God’s grace is extended to all, and is exhibited the most clearly where sin is greatest, shall we continue in sin, in order that God may have an opportunity to manifest his grace toward us? “God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?” To sin simply in order that God might have a chance to pardon, would be to tempt him. If such a course were pursued toward an earthly ruler, no one would expect to see a pardon granted. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 520.6*

We have learned, then, that those to whom God manifests his grace must not sin. And what is sin? "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for sin is the transgression of the law." *1 John 3:4*. So the subjects of grace must not transgress the law. In *verses 3-5* Paul introduces the subject of baptism, and says that we were baptized into Christ-planted in the likeness of his death. "We are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." This agrees exactly with what we read in *2 Corinthians 5:17*, that if any man be in Christ he is a new creature. "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." *Verse 6*. "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." *Verse 11*. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 520.7*

In *verses 12 and 13* he exhorts to shun sin and to "yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God." And now we come to the fourteenth verse: "For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace." If people would read the whole of this verse, it would scarcely be possible for them to conclude that "not under the law" means freedom to break it at pleasure. Let us notice. What is sin? "Sin is the transgression of the law." *1 John 3:4*. Now Paul says to certain ones: "Sin shall not have dominion over you." Why not? Because "Ye are not under the law, but under grace." Then we learn that those who are not under the law are not under the dominion of sin; and the apostle's words are framed in such a manner as to force us to conclude that those who are under the law are under the dominion of sin. But sin, as we have learned, is the transgression of the law; therefore those who are under the law are those who sin, or break the law. It seems as though no one could fail to see this clearly. Paul's words, then, in *verse 14* amount simply to this: That those to whom God has manifested his pardoning grace will not yield themselves to break his law. But this very argument shows that the law is in full force, for if it were not, they could not put themselves under it. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 520.8*

The succeeding verses sustain this point: "What then? shall we sin,

because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid.” *Verse 15.* This is simply a repetition of *verses 1 and 2.* Let us illustrate the apostle’s meaning by a familiar occurrence. Here is a man who has stolen a horse. He has been found guilty, and sentenced to a term of years in the penitentiary. He has transgressed the law, and it has its strong hand upon him; he is under the law. It is the law that shuts him up in prison and holds him there. But before his sentence has expired, friends intercede for him and the governor pardons him. He is now a free man; the law does not hold him any longer. He is indebted, however, to the governor for his liberty. The governor was under no obligation to interfere in his case, and set him free; that was simply an act of favor, or grace. The man is therefore a subject of the governor’s grace. Now what will he do? You say that if he appreciates the favor that has been shown him, he will lead an orderly, quiet life, and will never again be guilty of violating the law. It was only with the understanding that he would do so that the governor pardoned him. Suppose, however, he should say, “Now I am a free man; the law held me for a while, but I am not now under it; I am a subject of the governor’s special favor. I can now steal horses, or do anything I please.” You say at once that if the authorities heard of his words they would have him watched, and should he be found breaking the law again, he would speedily be remanded to prison. The governor in granting him special favor did not give him license to break the law. That act of favor simply placed the man once more in the position that he was before he violated the law, except that his obligation to keep it is greatly increased. If before he was set free he had made known his determination to steal again, the governor would never have shown him any favor at all. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 520.9*

Nobody has any difficulty in understanding a case like the above. Well, we may apply the same principles to men in their relation to God. What we want to remember is that all men have transgressed the law, and brought themselves into condemnation and can get no help except from God. On account of Christ’s sacrifice, however, and through his intercession, God is willing to bestow his grace upon all, and thus freely justify them. But he will not save those who are satisfied to be under condemnation; they must have a desire to be free. And how may it be known who wish to become free, and who are satisfied to remain in bondage to sin? Simply by their

actions. If they love sin, and are determined not to cease violating the law, no further evidence is needed. Favor shown to such would be favor thrown away. But those who groan, as did Paul, to be free from the load of guilt that rests upon them, may with safety be given their liberty, for they will not use it as a license to sin still more. E. J. W. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 520.10*

“Spiritualistic Theology” The Signs of the Times, 10, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

Two weeks ago a sermon was preached in the Calvary Presbyterian Church, San Francisco, on this subject: “Do the Dead Revisit this Earth, and Take an Interest in Earthly Affairs?” From the brief synopsis of the discourse, as it appeared in the *Bulletin* next day, we quote the following: -*SITI August 28, 1884, page 520.11*

“He thought that there are no dead; that those who have passed away are now living in the full possession of all the faculties possessed here.... The speaker went on to say that the spirits of our departed friends and relatives were with us, always hovering near,” etc. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 520.12*

We hope that is not a sample of the sermons that are preached. In fact, we know it is not; for we do not think that Spiritualism has yet captured the world entirely. We wish to make one or two comments from a Bible stand-point; but first we will call attention to the inconsistency between the subject and the discourse itself. “Do the Dead Revisit this Earth?” was the subject, and one of the first statements was that there are no dead. If so, then the only possible answer to his question is, No. The subject was very inappropriate, or else the sermon was all a mistake. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 520.13*

As we read the report, we could not help asking, Did the man ever read the Bible? and if so, does he believe it? Even the Revised Version, with all its changes, has not dropped the words “dead” and “death.” If there are no dead, what does the Bible mean when it says of each one of the patriarchs, “And he died”? What are we to understand when we read, “It is appointed unto man once to die”

(*Hebrews 9:27*); “by one man seventh came into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men” (*Romans 5:12*); and many similar passages which speak of death? Does the “Reverend Doctor” wish us to take his “thoughts” in preference to the Bible? And if it is permitted us to believe the Bible, in what Dictionary will we find a proper definition of Bible words? For if we take Webster’s definition of Bible terms, the preacher’s suppositions are greatly at fault. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 521.1*

Again, he thinks “that those who have passed away are now living in the full possession of all the faculties possessed here.” What reason has he for thinking so? When Hezekiah was sick, the Lord said to him, “Set thine house in order; for *thou shall die and not live.*” *Isaiah 38:1*. Christ says: “I am he that live with, and was dead.” *Revelation 1:18*. The Bible recognizes the great difference between life and death. Hezekiah saw so much difference that he wept sore at the thought that he should die and not live. Now, query: If “death” means “life,” are not the terms identical? They must be, and therefore “life” means “death,” and “living” means “dead.” Then why are we not justified in saying that there are no living? that all who are on earth are dead, and “no not anything”? Would we be any farther out of the way than the San Francisco preacher? *SITI August 28, 1884, page 521.2*

The speaker thought that the dead are in possession of all their faculties. We do not. Do you want to know how we dare differ with a man who writes “D. D.” After his name? If you have a Bible, open it and turned to *Ecclesiastes 9:5*. Now read slowly: “For the living know that they shall die [some pretend not to]; but *the dead know not anything.*” Read also the tenth verse: “Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, *nor knowledge, nor wisdom,* in the grave wither thou goest.” We commend this verse to the preacher above mentioned, with this explanation thrown in, that when Solomon says, “Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might,” he has no reference to preaching sermons the contradicts the Bible. Read once more: “Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish.” *Psalms 146:3, 4*. Are we not justified in different with the learned doctor? We advise our friend who is

looking up these references, to read carefully the last quotation. "Put not your trust in princes," neither in doctors of divinity, but in the word of the Lord, which abideth forever. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 521.3*

Once more, "The spirits of our departed friends and relatives are with us, always hovering near." Again we dissent. Why? Read the preceding paragraph again, and you will see. But we ask you to open your Bible once more, and turn this time to Job, and read the fourteenth chapter at your leisure. We will together read *verses 19-21*: "Thou destroyest the hope of man. Thou prevailest for ever against him, and he passeth: thou changest his countenance, and sendest him away. His sons come to honour, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them." Will someone tell us why we should not believe the words of the Bible rather than those of a man? *SITI August 28, 1884, page 521.4*

It is not probable that one of those who listened to that sermon dreamed that it was a Spiritualist sermon. They would be surprised, perhaps indignant, if you should tell them so. "Why," they might say, "Spiritualism is something horrible, but we don't see anything bad about this." Is it not a horrible thing to ignore and deny God's holy word? Read *Jeremiah 5:30, 31*, and see what did Lord says about it. Spiritualism is simply the doctrine that there is really no death, but that the (so-called) dead may hold communication with the (so-called) living. The only terrible thing about it is that it is a square denial of the Bible, the inspired word of God, and an acceptance of the words of Satan, the father of lies, who first promulgated the doctrine. See *Genesis 3:4*. But a more terrible thing than this we cannot imagine. And the most frightful thing of all is that people look upon it as truth, and think that it is pleasant. What is to hinder the whole world from being swamped in this last great delusion of the archdeceiver? Nothing but the plain truth is of God's word, repeated again and again. But, alas! with the majority even this will not avail, for "my people doth not consider." E. J. W. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 521.5*

"Eternal Life" The Signs of the Times, 10, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

From a study of the doctrine of the second advent, and the kindred doctrine, the resurrection, we have arrived at the necessary conclusion that if Christ were not to come there would be no hope of salvation for any of his followers. The leading place which is given to this subject in the Bible, and especially in the New Testament, is enough to convince any one of its great importance; and when we considered Christ's words, that his second coming would be for the express purpose of taking his disciples to himself, we see why it is given so much prominence. We dare not regard our Saviour's word so lightly as to say that his promises mean nothing; but if his followers can be with him before his second coming, then his coming in *John 14:3* has no meaning whatever. So, as we said, we are driven to the conclusion that the people of God must wait for their salvation until the Lord comes. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 521.6*

Our reading of the Bible has also shown us that the resurrection is a "living *again*," which implies a previous cessation of life. This would teach us that there is no life between death and the resurrection; for a man cannot "live again" unless he has ceased to live. And since there is no resurrection until the Lord comes, it follows that if he were not to come there would be no life for his people. There can be no escape from this conclusion; we will verify it by the plain declarations of Scripture. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 521.7*

There are no words of the Bible more familiar to the Christian, or more dear to him, than these words of Christ to Nicodemus: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." *John 3:16*. The love of God to man is beyond all human comprehension. Even the angels, we are told (*1 Peter 1:12*), desire to look into and understand the mystery of the plan of salvation. But none but God himself can comprehend the love that prompted that vast scheme. To all eternity it will be the wonder of both saints and angels. Human hearts know something of love, and some can perhaps imagine the anguish they would feel if called upon to give up an only child to suffer cruel torture and an ignominious death. But the love of an infinite God must be as much greater than that felt by mortals, as God himself is greater than man. Yet he gave his only begotten Son,-the one by whom all things were made, whom

the angels worship with reverence equal to that which they yield to God,-that man might have eternal life. Then certainly men do not have eternal life, or, what is the same thing, immortality, by nature.*SITI August 28, 1884, page 521.8*

Men often work to no purpose, and spend time and strength for that which is wholly unnecessary; but it is not possible to imagine such a thing of God. Since he knows the end from the beginning, he knows what is necessary to be done, and what means are needed to accomplish it. Would God make such an infinite sacrifice to accomplish something entirely uncalled for? to give to man that which he already possessed? Certainly not. If left to themselves, man would never have had even a hope of eternal life.*SITI August 28, 1884, page 522.1*

And right here is worth our while to consider what this wonderful thing is that was bought for us at such a price. There are few that value it as they ought. If men appreciated it, then there would be a general ascription of praise to God for his love in bringing it to us. In the first place we must remember that it is eternal life and that alone that is brought within our reach by the gift of God's Son. So Paul says: "For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life to Jesus Christ our Lord." *Romans 6:23*. Eternal life is life to all eternity-life that has no end. Now what is life? It is simply existence. Nothing else is contained in the word. The poor man who drudges for a bare subsistence, the invalid who has no waking moment that is free from pain, the beast that possesses no moral sense, the idiot who is even lower in the scale of intelligence than the brute,-all these live just as certainly as does the man who possesses health, wealth, the keenest perception, and a sense of moral obligation. We can say of one that he has a happy life, and of another that his life is miserable, even a burden, but these ideas could not be conveyed by the unqualified term "life." When we hear that a man lives, we know that he exists, and that is all that we know. He may be ill or well, wealthy or in the depths of poverty, enjoying perfect happiness or suffering extreme anguish, yet we can know nothing of this unless we are told something more than the mere fact that he lives.*SITI August 28, 1884, page 522.2*

What then is *eternal* life? Simply eternal existence. Then it is eternal

existence that is brought within man's reach by the sacrifice of Christ. We do not say that the redeemed will not enjoy perfect happiness, but that is not the primary thing that is given to the overcomer. The happiness of the redeemed is a secondary matter, growing out of the circumstances in which they are placed. That happiness should be the lot of men who spend an eternity in the presence of God and of Christ, where nothing can happen to annoy, is a natural consequence. Unending existence, then, is what is promised to those who believe in the Son of God.*SITI August 28, 1884, page 522.3*

And now we notice that "whosoever believeth in him" shall have eternal life. What shall they have who do not believe in him? Shall it be eternal life? If it is so, that all men have immortality by nature, then what is gained by believing in Jesus? How much better off are believers than unbelievers? None at all. Is it reasonable to suppose that God would hold up to man an unending existence as an incentive for him to accept of Christ, if he were already in possession of it, and if he had it so securely that God himself could not deprive him of it? There is no one who will not say, No, to such a proposition. We repeat: If all men are by nature in possession of immortality, then the gospel holds out no inducement for man to believe in Christ.*SITI August 28, 1884, page 522.4*

It cannot here be argued by those who hold that man is essentially immortal, that the unbelievers will be worse off than the believers in that they will be doomed to hopeless misery, because, as we have seen, it is life pure and simple that is held out as the prize. The text does not say that God gave his Son in order that whosoever believeth in him should not be miserable, but have happiness. We must take the text as it reads, and not attach anything to that that is not contained in it. From *John 3:16* we can reach no other conclusion than that those who do not believe in Christ will not have eternal life. And this fact is plainly stated in the thirty-sixth verse of the same chapter: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life."*SITI August 28, 1884, page 522.5*

Eternal life is the grand object for which man was created. This present life is a period of probation, in which we are proved, to see

if we would know how to use so great a boon. If we desire eternal life earnestly enough to comply with the conditions, it will at the last day be bestowed upon us; but if we squander this life, and dishonor God, what encouragement will he have to extend our life to all eternity? He will not do it. And since those who disobey God never get beyond this probationary state, the anteroom, as it were, of life, it can be truly said of them that they do not see life. How it is that they who have Christ have eternal life (*John 3:36*) will be considered next week. E. J. W. *SITI August 28, 1884, page 522.6*

September 4, 1884

“The Sabbath-School” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—SEPT. 27

1. What question did Job ask concerning death? *Job 14:14.SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.1*
2. Until what event did he say he would wait?*SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.2*
3. In what place did he say he would wait for this change? *Job 17:13.SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.3*
4. When does this change come? *1 Corinthians 15:51-54.SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.4*
5. What did Job say the Lord would do? *Job 14:15.SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.5*
6. When does the Lord thus call for his people? *Psalms 50:3, 4.SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.6*
7. From what place does he call them? *John 5:28, 29.SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.7*
8. Then when is it that the saints are changed to immortality?*SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.8*
9. How did Paul regard whatever earthly possessions he might gain? *Philippians 3:7, 8.SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.9*
10. What was he willing to undergo? *Verse 10.SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.10*
11. Why was he so willing to suffer these hardships? *Verse 11.SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.11*

12. Did he have any other incentive to labor and suffer except the promised to resurrection of the dead? *1 Corinthians 15:32.SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.12*

13. What fact gives us the assurance that the dead will be raised? *1 Corinthians 15:12, 13.SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.13*

14. How strong an array of evidence have we that Christ was raised from the dead? *1 Corinthians 15:3-8.SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.14*

15. If we say that there is no resurrection, what do we virtually deny? *1 Corinthians 15:16.SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.15*

16. Why did Paul say that his sufferings for Christ were to no profit if the dead rise not? *1 Corinthians 15:18.SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.16*

17. What is the meaning of “perish”? *SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.17*

18. Then what must be the condition of those who have fallen asleep in Jesus? *SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.18*

19. By whom will they be rescued from this condition? *1 Corinthians 15:22.SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.19*

“If a man die, shall he live again?” *Job 14:14*. This most important question was asked by Job when he was apparently near the end of his life. The reader will notice that the preceding verses, and the question itself, recognize the difference between life and death. The are dead not living, else the question could not with propriety be asked, Shall they live *again*? If the question should be asked concerning an individual, “Is he coming again?” everybody would understand that the person referred to is not now present; if he were present, or did not design to go away, the proper question to ask would be, “Will he remain?” So of the case in hand. If death is something the direct opposite of life, Job’s question was all right; but if the dead are alive, he should have asked, “If a man die, shall he continue to live,” or, still more appropriately, “Shall a man always live?” But we will accept Job’s question as having the correct form;

for we are not to understand the Bible according to our theories, but to correct our theories by the Bible.*SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.20*

The patriarch did not ask the above question because he was skeptical, or in doubt. In the very next verse he says: "Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee; thou wilt have a desire to the work of thy hands." So he expected to die, and expected also that the Lord would call for him. When does the Lord call for his people? Turning to the fiftieth psalm, we read the answer in verses three and four: "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him. He shall call to the heavens from above, and to the earth, that he may judge his people." The calling of the dead takes place, then, when the Lord comes in power and great glory.*SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.21*

But did not Job expect to be called immediately, as soon as he died, and not be obliged to wait until the coming of the Lord? Let him answer. We quote the remainder of the verse first noticed, *chap. 14:14*: "All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come." Then he says, as already quoted, "Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee." The "change," therefore, does not take place until the Lord calls, and until that time Job expected to wait. Now in what place did he say he would wait? He gives the answer in *chap. 17:13*: "If I wait, the grave is my house; I have made my bed in the darkness." He expected to remain in the grave until the Lord should call him forth to his change. And this agrees with the words of Christ concerning the dead, in *John 5:28, 29*: "Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."*SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.22*

"All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come." What is the change of which the patriarch spoke? We have seen that it is to take place at the coming of Christ; and we shall therefore have no difficulty in deciding what it is. Paul says to the brethren: "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall

all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.” *1 Corinthians 15:51, 52*. Here is the change for the dead,-they shall be raised “incorruptible.” Will the change for the living be anything different? He continues: “For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.” *Verse 53*. That is the change; from mortal to immortal. We have then found that immortality is not the possession of man in this life, neither does it become theirs at death, but that it is to be “put on” at the coming of the Lord; and this is the “change” for which Job expected to wait in the grave.*SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.23*

The apostle Paul was, without doubt, one of the most active, energetic men that ever lived. It is doubtful if any other man ever labored so hard, and suffered so much for the gospel as he did. Read the brief narrative of his life in the Acts of the apostles, and his statement in *2 Corinthians 11:23-33*. Before he became a Christian he was held in high repute by the Jews, and occupied a leading place in the national council. There was nothing that, with his abilities, he might not have possessed. Yet he says: “But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith; that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death.” *Philippians 3:7-10*. And what was the grand thing to be gained, for which he so willingly suffered the loss of all earthly gain? The next verse contains the answer: “If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.” This, to Paul, was more than all things else.*SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.24*

From the above we should suppose that the doctrine of the resurrection is one of great importance. We shall see that Paul had no other hope but in the resurrection of the dead. In *1 Corinthians 15:32* we read: “If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts

at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die.” That is to say, “If there be no resurrection of the dead, all my labor and self-denial has been to no purpose. We might as well get all the enjoyment out of this life that we can, for this life will be the sum total of our existence.” His only hope of a future life was based on the resurrection. According to Paul, then, whoever says that there will be no resurrection virtually says that there is no hereafter for man.*SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.25*

In this chapter (*1 Corinthians 15*) Paul bases his argument for the resurrection on the fact that Christ was raised. “If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen.” *Verse 13*. Of course. If one individual has ever been raised from the dead, it is proof that there is such a thing as a resurrection. That Christ was raised, he cites the most conclusive testimony. “He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve; after that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles.” *1 Corinthians 15:5-7*. No court could ask for better evidence that a certain thing was done, than that it was seen by above five hundred trustworthy witnesses. There is no effective history better established than is the resurrection of Christ. But if Christ is raised, then all men will be raised, “For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall be made alive.” *Verse 22. SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.26*

Having shown the close connection between the resurrection of Christ and the general resurrection,-a connection so close that the establish one establishes the other,-Paul sums the whole thing up in *verses 16-18*, and shows the consequence to man if there should be no resurrection. He says: “For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; but and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.” And this is why so much prominence is given in the Bible to the doctrine of the resurrection.*SITI September 4, 1884, page 534.27*

The word “perish” is defined by Webster as follows: “To be destroyed; to go to destruction; to pass away; to come to nothing; to

be blotted from existence; to be ruined; to be lost.” Now if there is no resurrection, those that have fallen asleep are perished. Let us take a single case, that of Abraham, for instance. He died nearly two thousand years before Christ. He died in hope of a resurrection, but that hope was based on the fact that Christ was to die and be raised from the dead. Suppose now, for a moment, that Christ had not come, and the dead were to have no resurrection; what would be Abraham’s condition? *Perished*, says Paul. But was his condition any different after Christ came than it was before? If the plan of salvation had been overturned, would there have been a change in Abraham’s condition in the grave? Certainly not. Then he must now be in exactly the same state that he would be if there were no such thing as a resurrection. And what is that? Out of existence. And this is just the state of the dead until the resurrection takes place. That event marks a great change for the dead, but if it did not take place, they would forever remain in the state in which they are now. Or, to state the case more plainly, the dead are now in just the condition that they would be to all eternity if there were no resurrection. The only hope for the dead is the promise of God, and that cannot fail. E. J. W. *SITI* September 4, 1884, page 534.28

“Under the Law (Continued.)” The Signs of the Times, 10, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

(Continued.)

Besides *Romans 6:14*, which was examined last week, there are several other instances of the use of the term “under the law.” We wish to examine these also, to see if we are justified in our conclusion that the expression is used to denote a state of condemnation. We will first, however, take up *Romans 6* where we left off. In the fifteenth verse Paul expresses his astonishment that any one who is a subject of grace should think of again sinning. In the sixteenth verse he says: “Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?” Here the idea of service is introduced. If they should yield themselves to sin, they would hereby become its servants. In the two following verses the same idea is expressed. Whereas they

were bound by sin, in a bondage that could end only in death, they are now made free, and are the servants of righteousness. But the servants of righteousness,-those who keep the law,-are free men; for the law itself is a law of liberty (*James 1:25*), and David is authority for the statement that those who keep the law walk at liberty. *Psalms 119:45*. Christ also says to his disciples: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." *John 8:32*. *SITI September 4, 1884, page 537.1*

In the book of Galatians the term "under the law" occurs several times, and in such connection as to leave no doubt as to its meaning. We first turn to the fifth chapter and read: "Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lusts of the flesh." *Verse 16*. The reader will find the parallel to this in *Romans 8:9*: "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you." In the seventeenth verse the enmity between the flesh and the Spirit of God is stated. "For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would." Compare this with *Romans 8:7, 8*: "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." Also with the account of the struggles of the convicted sinner, as recorded in the latter part of *Romans 7*. *SITI September 4, 1884, page 537.2*

Now read *Galatians 5:18*: "But if ye be led by the Spirit, ye are not under the law." We have seen that they alone can please God who are led by the Spirit, and here we learn that such are not under the law. Now what is done by those who walk after (or are led by) the Spirit? Paul says that "God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness (requirement) of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." *Romans 8:3, 4*. If we fulfill the righteousness of the law, we must conform to its slightest requirement, that is, obey it perfectly. That is what it is to be led by the Spirit; and we have read (*Galatians 5:18*) that those who are led by the Spirit are not under the law. It is very clear, then, that spiritually minded persons-those who keep the law-are not under the law; and so we again arrive at the unavoidable conclusion that those who do not keep the law are under it. *SITI September 4, 1884,*

This may be made still more evident. We have already read that the works of the flesh are the direct opposite of the works of the Spirit. And what are the works of the flesh? Paul answers: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murder, drunkenness, revelings, and such like; of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in times past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." *Galatians 5:19-21*. These things are all forbidden by the law. For proof, see the law itself, and Christ's comments on it in the fifth chapter of Matthew. Now, bearing in mind that doing the works of the flesh make one under the law, we learn that to be under the law one has only to violate it. *SITI September 4, 1884, page 537.4*

Again: "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." *Galatians 5:22, 23*. That is what is done by those who are led by the Spirit, and Paul says: "Against such, there is no law." The law does not condemn a man who does those things, because he is led by the Spirit; but it is against the things enumerated as the works of the flesh. It condemns the doers of such things. *SITI September 4, 1884, page 537.5*

In harmony with the above are Paul's words in *1 Timothy 1:9, 10*: "Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for man slayers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for men-stealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine." *SITI September 4, 1884, page 537.6*

The word "made" in the above text is from *keimai*, to lay, or place, and the meaning is that the law is not laid or placed against a righteous man, but against the lawless. That is, it does not interfere with the actions of a righteous man, but it comes in direct conflict with a wicked man. That this is the meaning, is shown by the

preceding argument. Paul says in *verse 5* that the end, or object, of the commandment is love. In other words, as has been shown in a previous article, the design of the law is that it should be kept. Now a righteous man is one who keeps the law-fulfills its requirements-and therefore the law has no controversy with him. The man who keeps the law, has no fear of it. But some, the apostle says (*verse 6*), not having aimed at the law, have turned aside unto vain jangling. Because they have not tried to keep the law, they have got into trouble. "But," he continues, "we know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully." *Verse 8*. Can this mean that a man's acts will have any effect on the law to make it either better or worse than it was when it was given? Is the law a good law when it is obeyed, and a bad law when it is disobeyed? By no means. Whatever a man may do, the law remains the same,-holy, and just, and good. If a man use it lawfully, that is, if he obeys the law (for that is the only way a law can be used lawfully), it is good to him; it then finds no fault with him. But if a man does not use it lawfully, if he does things that are unlawful, the law is not good to him; it is against him at once. If the law lies against a wicked man, how very natural to speak of man as under it.*SITI September 4, 1884, page 537.7*

Dr. Adam Clarke, speaking of the moral law in his comments on 1 *Timothy 1:9*, says:-*SITI September 4, 1884, page 537.8*

"It was, therefore, not made for the righteous as a restrainer of crimes, and an inflicter of punishments; for the righteous avoid sin, and by living to the glory of God, expose not themselves to its censure. This seems to be the mind of the apostle; he does not say that the law was not MADE for a righteous man; but *ou keitai* it does not *lie against* a righteous man, because he does not transgress it. But it *lies against* the wicked, for such, as the apostle mentions, have broken it, and grievously too, and are condemned by it. The word *keitai*, *lies*, refers to the custom of writing laws on boards, and hanging them up in public places within reach of every man, that they might be read by all; thus all would see against whom the law lay."*SITI September 4, 1884, page 537.9*

In our next article we shall consider a passage that brings out more clearly than anything yet noticed the meaning of the term "under the law." E. J. W.*SITI September 4, 1884, page 537.10*

(To be continued.)

“Immortality” The Signs of the Times, 10, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

In all investigation of Bible doctrines it must be borne in mind that the Bible was written by inspiration of God, and must, therefore, be perfectly consistent with itself. If we find passages which seem to conflict, we must conclude that we do not fully understand them. Besides this, we must always interpret those parts that are obscure and indefinite by those that are definite and plain. This is but reasonable. If we have a friend whom we know to be perfectly honest, and two expressions of his that seem contradictory are reported to us, we do not condemn him until he has had an opportunity to explain. We expect that when we learn all that he said, we will find that the two statements agree. Neither would we take a statement definitely and emphatically expressed, and offset it by words from which, taken by themselves, we might infer something directly the opposite. It is thus fairly that we must deal with the Bible. We are not at liberty to draw, from in the passage, an *inference* that is up but opposed to the plain declarations of the word. *SITI September 4, 1884, page 537.11*

Now we have brought forward texts of Scripture that have no double meaning, which prove that God's people are rewarded only at the coming of Christ and the resurrection, and that all men are dependent on Christ for eternal life. There are no doubt other texts from which the reader gathers that men are essentially immortal; these will be considered in due time, but in the meantime we ask the reader to let the plain statements that we quote have their full weight. *SITI September 4, 1884, page 537.12*

Last week we quoted Christ's words: "He that believeth on the Son have everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." *John 3:36*. This is a plain statement that those who do not believe in Christ will not live eternally. The question now arises, In what sense do those who believe on Christ have eternal life now? Let us read the answer: "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and *this life is in his Son*." *1 John 5:11*. Now turn

and read the introduction to Paul's second letter to Timothy: "Paul, and apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, according to *the promise of life* which is in Christ Jesus." Here we have the answer complete. Eternal life is ours by promise, if we believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, through whom alone it may be obtained. If a young man possesses the writings which show that he is heir to a certain estate, he will speak of the estate as his, even though he is not in possession of it, and has no voice in its control. *SITI September 4, 1884, page 537.13*

When many of Christ's disciples became offended and left him, he turned to the twelve and asked, "Will ye also go away question?" "Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of the eternal life." *John 6:66-68*. The twelve believed as Christ had said, that "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life." If this be not true, what a chance for retort the unbelieving Jews had when Christ said to them: "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." *John 5:40*. They might have said, "We have no need to come to you for life, for we are immortal by nature." And is not this a logical position for those to take who believe that the essential part of man, the real man, can never die? We may not openly repudiate Christ as did the Jews, yet if we say that we already have that which he came to bestow, do we not thereby signify our independence of him? The only inducement that he holds out for our accepting him is that he can give us life. Now if we proudly insist that we have life, do we not treat his offer with contempt, and so dishonor him? So long as we insist that we are not dependent on him for eternal life, our professions to accept him have a good deal the air of patronizing condescension. *SITI September 4, 1884, page 538.1*

Let us have some more plain declarations. In *1 Timothy 6:12* Paul charges Timothy to "fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life." A man cannot "lay hold" of something that he already has hold of. And how should he "lay hold" on eternal life? By exercising faith: and this again is in harmony with Christ's words in *John 3:16, 36*. The apostle then charges Timothy to "keep this commandment without spot, and blemish, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ; which in his times he shall show who is the blessed and only potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath

immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see." *Verses 13-16*. This language must refer to God the Father, for although Christ in Revelation is called "King of kings and Lord of lords," it is he in this instance who is going to make known the "blessed and only potentate;" and further, the one here spoken of is one "whom no man hath seen, neither can see;" but Christ has been seen many times. *SITI September 4, 1884, page 538.2*

But to the gist of the statement. It is that God only hath immortality. So long as the Bible remains, this text will be a standing rebuke to those who claim immortality as theirs by right. That is an attribute of God alone. "But," says one, "is not Christ immortal? and do we not read of the angels that they cannot die?" Yes; and we turn to *John 5:26* and read Christ's words: "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." Christ, then, being the only begotten Son of God, partakes of his attributes, and has life in himself. That is, he is able to impart life to others. The text in Timothy does not shut off any one from obtaining immortality, but if it is obtained it must be as a gift from God. It is in this way that the angels are immortal. *SITI September 4, 1884, page 538.3*

Turn now to *Romans 2:5-7*. There Paul states that God will render "to every man according to his deeds." "To them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, [he will render] eternal life." "Immortality" means the condition in which one cannot die, and "eternal life" means unending existence; the terms, therefore, are synonymous, and the verse is equivalent to the statement that God will render immortality to those who seek for it. Two points are here made: 1. In order to gain eternal life we must seek for it. Then those who do not seek for it will never receive it. 2. The only proper way to seek for immortality is by "patient continuance in well-doing." Then those who do not do well, will not obtain eternal life, even though they may desire it. *SITI September 4, 1884, page 538.4*

Again: In *2 Timothy 1:9*, Paul says that the purpose and grace of God, which was given us in Christ Jesus, "is now made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the

gospel.” Here then we learn the place in which we are to seek for immortality. It is in the gospel. Whoever looks for it in any other place will fail to find it. *SITI September 4, 1884, page 538.5*

Having learned how immortality may be obtained, we have only one thing to consider, and that is when it will be bestowed; when believers in Christ will come into possession of their promised inheritance. This is definitely settled by Paul in the fifteenth of 1 Corinthians, in a text which we have before quoted. We begin with *verse 50*: “Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherent in corruption.” This statement might raise a query in the minds of some, so Paul adds: “Behold I show you [that is, make known to you] a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump.” *Verses 51, 52*. This, then, explains how we may get into the kingdom of God, even though flesh and blood cannot inherit it. “We shall be *changed*.” And when does this change take place? “At the last trump.” And what will the change be? “For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must *put on* immortality.” *Verses 52, 53. SITI September 4, 1884, page 538.6*

“This *mortal* must put on immortality.” The Bible writers never speak of man as being anything else than mortal. “Shall mortal man be more just than God?” *Job 4:17*. How could they speak otherwise, since God only has immortality? The contrast is sharply drawn in *Romans 1:23*. Paul speaks of the heathen, who had “changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image like unto corruptible man.” God is immortal, incorruptible; man is mortal, corruptible. But we are to be *changed*, and then we shall be like him, immortal. *SITI September 4, 1884, page 538.7*

“So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory.” *1 Corinthians 15:54*. And this occurs, as the preceding verses show, at the coming of the Lord. *SITI September 4, 1884, page 538.8*

We have now quoted, besides several texts that speak of “eternal life,” every text in the Bible that contains the word “immortality.” Let us see what we have found. 1. God alone has immortality. This, of course, applies to Christ, who, as the Son of God, partakes of his nature, and who is entitled to be called God. 2. If man would have immortality, he must seek for it. 3. The only proper way to seek for it is by patient continuance in well-doing. 4. Man can find immortality only in the gospel, for it is there that it is brought to light. 5. It belongs to everyone who believes in Christ, but only by promise. This life is now in Christ, and whoever has Christ, has eternal life, because he is in possession of that which will bring it to him. 6. This promise of life will be fulfilled, and man’s search for the immortality will be crowned with success, when “the Lord himself shall descend from Heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God.” Then those who have fought the good fight of faith will be crowned as victors with “a crown of glory that fadeth not away.” E. J. W. *SITI September 4, 1884, page 538.9*

September 11, 1884

“How Will They Do It?” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 35.

E. J. Waggoner

We are not entirely alone in the belief that Spiritualism is of the devil, as the following from the *Pacific Methodist* will show:-*SITI September 11, 1884, page 552.1*

“We regard Spiritualism as among the most infernal of Satan’s inventions and its absurdness before the bar of enlightened reason is not proof sufficient of its harmlessness, when we reflect that nothing is too preposterous to believe, when the appeal is made through the senses, and is one which accords with the reigning corruption of the soul..... We doubt if Christianity has ever before confronted such a monster as this modern necromancy. And this repulsive hybrid from the cesspools of nameless infamy reigns over many, and is spreading its borders. Let the press speak, and the pulpit but cry aloud.”*SITI September 11, 1884, page 552.2*

“The voice said, Cry. And he said, What shall I cry?” This is what the “press and the pulpit” might well ask. We are glad when we see any one aroused over the terrible delusion of Spiritualism. But what can they say or do against it? Will they cry out against the corruption that is often associated with it? That would be simply an attempt to lop off some of the other branches, leaving the root untouched. Besides, if that is all that our friend the *Methodist* would assail, he would find his efforts seconded by many Spiritualists themselves. There are thousands of them who outwardly lead moral lives, so far as their fellow-men are concerned. Therefore a person might assail vice and corruption with all his power, and still leave Spiritualism unscathed.*SITI September 11, 1884, page 552.3*

If the *Methodist* really wants to strike at the root of Spiritualism, we will tell it how. Let it teach the Bible doctrine concerning the state of the dead. Let it teach that “the dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down in the silence” (*Psalms 115:17*); that “the dead know not anything” (*Ecclesiastes 9:5*); that man’s “breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish” (*Psalms*

146:4); that they “sleep in the dust of the earth” (*Daniel 12:2*); and that “till the heavens be no more they shall not awake, nor be raised out of sleep.” *Job 14:12*. *SITI September 11, 1884, page 552.4*

He who with all his heart believes these plain declarations of Scripture, can never be a Spiritualist. A belief in the conscious state of the dead is the foundation and superstructure of Spiritualism. He who holds to that doctrine has no warrant that he will not be a Spiritualist; indeed, there is hardly a possibility that he will not, when evidence is presented that appeals overpoweringly to his *senses*. Nothing but a firm belief in the word of God, *as it reads*, will save man from Satan’s masterpiece of deception. *SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.1*

We know that many try to make a distinction, and say that while they believe that departed ones are conscious and active, they do not believe that they can communicate with their friends in the flesh. Well, why do they not? Have they any *reason* for thinking that the dead cannot communicate with the living? “Why, certainly,” says one, “the Bible says that they cannot.” Exactly; we quoted several passages at the beginning of this article. The Bible says that the dead cannot communicate with the living, because they are unconscious, “they know not anything.” And no man can prove that the dead cannot make themselves known to us, without using those texts which declare that they have no conscious existence. *SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.2*

Perhaps there are Christians who see nothing shocking in such teaching. They say, “It is a matter of no *practical* importance how I believe concerning the dead. We could be just as good, even if we believed that the dead could return to us.” Do not thus deceive yourselves. For what purpose did Christ come? He says he came “that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life.” *John 3:16*. And again, “I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.” *John 10:10*. Now if we believe that we shall never die, but that, when that which men call death takes place, we shall go right on just as we do now, only under somewhat improved conditions, where does faith in Christ come in? What inducement can we have to believe in him? Cannot all see that those who hold such a theory leave Christ out of

their religion entirely?*SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.3*

And this is just what Spiritualism actually does. It rejects Christ. There is no Spiritualist who believes in Christ as a Saviour; they regard him as a good man, and that is all. They have no room for a Saviour in their system. They repudiate Christ.*SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.4*

With this brief explanation all can see why we are so earnest in our teaching of conditional immortality. It is not as a mere theory which we can adopt or reject at pleasure, but a truth of vital importance. To accept the doctrines of Spiritualism is to reject Christ; and without him we can do nothing. *John 15:4, 5*. He is “made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.” *1 Corinthians 1:30*. We can be ‘complete’ only in him.*SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.5*

The *Methodist* truly says that Spiritualism is one of “Satan’s inventions;” it was invented by him when there were but two human beings on earth, and formulated in these words: “Thou shalt not surely die.” We shall not cease to cry out against this “modern necromancy.” We should be rejoiced if we might stand side by side with the *Methodist* in this fight. The Bible, and that alone, will furnish the weapons. E. J. W.*SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.6*

“Under the Law. (Continued.)” The Signs of the Times, 10, 35.

E. J. Waggoner

Before directly considering the remaining passages containing the expression “under the law,” we wish briefly to recapitulate some points already canvassed, simply stating propositions, and referring to the texts which establish them.*SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.7*

1. The keeping of the law of God is the whole duty of man. *Ecclesiastes 12:13*. The fact that the word “man” is unqualified, shows that no particular man or race of men is referred to, but that the wise man intended to include the whole human race. It is the duty of all men to love God and their fellowmen.*SITI September 11,*

1884, page 553.8

2. Those who obey the law will stand justified before God. *Romans 2:13*. This proposition follows as a natural consequence of the first; for a just God will never condemn a man who does his whole duty. Nothing more than that can possibly be required of anybody. *SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.9*

3. But no man has done his whole duty, for none have kept the law perfectly. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." *Romans 3:23* also *verses 9-12*. "What things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." *Romans 3:19*. *SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.10*

4. "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." *Romans 3:20*. This is the direct consequence of the fact stated in *verse 19*. A good law will never justify evil-doers. And in these two verses we again have proof that the law was designed for the whole human family, and not for any particular class; for the law could not condemn those for whom it was not designed. That is to say, a law cannot condemn those who are not within its jurisdiction. But the law does condemn the whole world; therefore all the world are under its jurisdiction. *SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.11*

5. "Condemnation" is "the judicial act of declaring guilty and dooming to punishment."-Webster. It is the direct opposite of "justification," which is "a showing to be just or conformable to law, rectitude, or propriety."-*Ib*. Therefore since the law of God declares the whole world to be guilty before God, and will not justify a single individual, it follows that all the world are under the condemnation of the law of God. *SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.12*

6. The whole world being found guilty, and being condemned by the law, are said to be "under the law." *Romans 3:19*. Therefore "under the law" is a synonym for "condemned by the law." *SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.13*

7. Since all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God, we are "justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ

Jesus.” *Romans 3:24*. We are justified by faith alone, “without the deeds of the law,” *Romans 3:28*; for no amount of good deeds will atone for one sin. If a man had stolen a horse, abstaining from horse-stealing to all eternity would not in the least clear him from the guilt. If we are freed from past transgressions, it must be solely by an act of favor on the part of God.*SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.14*

8. This justification belongs only to those who believe in Jesus. *Romans 3:26*. It is purely a matter of faith on the part of the sinner, and of favor on the part of God. *Romans 3:21, 22, 28*. And therefore to obtain justification from past transgressions, the sinner has only to have sincere faith in Christ. It takes just as long to be justified as it does to have faith in Christ, and no longer.*SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.15*

9. “Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.” *Romans 5:1*. “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.” *Romans 8:1*. That is, those who are in Christ—those who have faith in Him—are not under the law; they are the subjects of God’s special favor.*SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.16*

10. As a consequence of all the preceding propositions, it follows that all men are under the law until they have faith in Christ; from that moment they are out from under the law, unless they again bring themselves into condemnation by again yielding themselves to sin.*SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.17*

11. The law was ordained to life. *Romans 7:10*. That is, if it had been kept perfectly, which is what was designed, it would have given the obedient one eternal life. See *Matthew 19:17*.*SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.18*

12. But “the wages of sin is death.” *Romans 6:23*. And since all men have sinned, all men are condemned to death. There is no law in existence by which man in his present condition can secure eternal life. That is the gift of God through Christ. But it is not the fault of the law that it cannot give life. It is just as holy and just and good as it was before. The fault lies in man alone. *Romans 7:12-14*.*SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.19*

We are now prepared to consider a passage of Scripture, portions of which have been quoted perhaps oftener than any other part of the Bible, as proving the abolition of the law, but which is one of the strongest proofs of its perpetuity. It is found in the third chapter of Galatians. *Verses 24, and 25* are supposed to teach that Christians need not keep the law. We shall consider these verses, as we do all others, in the light of the context. We shall have but little more to do than to refer to propositions already established by the Bible. We have not space to give Paul's argument in full from the beginning of the chapter, but will begin with the twenty-first verse. *SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.20*

The apostle speaks in some of the preceding verses of God's promise to Abraham, and, through him, to all the faithful. He says that the inheritance was simply by promise, through faith in Christ, yet the law was also given and designed to be kept. Then he asks, "Is the law then against the promises of God?" That is a very pertinent question. It opens the whole subject. Is the law against the promises of God? If we keep the law do we thereby manifest our disbelief of or contempt for the promises of God? Do we deny Christ by keeping the law? Paul answers in the same verse: "God forbid; for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law." *Galatians 3:21*. The idea is, The law is not against (in conflict with) the promises of God, because we do not expect to gain the inheritance through the keeping of the law. That this is true is proved by the simple fact that if the law could have given life, righteousness should have come by means of it, and there would have been no need of Christ's sacrifice and of the promises. So the simple fact that promises were given, proves that the law is powerless to give life. *SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.21*

And why is it that there could be no law that would give life? *Verse 22* contains the answer: "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." As we have already shown from the Scriptures, the reason why men cannot be justified and receive eternal life through the law is that "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." And now mark well this point: The existence of the law, instead of being against the promises of God, is so much in harmony with

them that they would amount to nothing without it. How so? Because, (1) "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." *1 Timothy 1:15*; (2) He can save only those who believe. *Mark 16:15*; *Acts 16:31*; *Romans 3:20*, etc.; (3) All men are sinners (*Romans 3:23*) whether they are conscious of it or not; but (4) No one can know that he is a sinner until he examines the law of God, for "by the law is the knowledge of sin." *Romans 3:20*, and (5) If a man did not find himself to be a sinner, he could not be induced to believe in Christ for the remission of sins; for if it is true that "they that are whole need not a physician," it is equally true that they that *think* they are whole will not apply to a physician, no matter how sorely they may stand in need of one; therefore, (6) It is absolutely necessary that the law be in the world, in order to lead men to lay hold on the promises. The law of itself could save no one; the promises would be of no benefit to men without the law to show them their need of those promises. The law, by showing all men to be sinners, makes it possible for the promises to be extended to all the world. Whoever, therefore, claims that he is no sinner, puts himself outside the promises of God. And now, as we quote the text again, we shall have a better understanding of it: "But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise of faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." *Galatians 3:22*. *SITI September 11, 1884, page 553.22*

"But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." *Verse 23*. Right here read once more the propositions at the beginning of this article, and the texts therein cited. In what condition does God's great sin detective, the law, show men to be? Guilty before God, - condemned to death. How can they be freed from this condition? By faith in Christ. There is no other way by which men can get free from condemnation. "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." *Acts 4:12*. Then how long must they remain in this state of condemnation? Until they can grasp the great truth of salvation through Christ alone, and exercise faith in him. They are "shut up" to this one way of escape. *SITI September 11, 1884, page 554.1*

We wish to call the reader's attention to the forcible figure here

introduced. Mr. A has killed a man. In so doing he has broken the law of the State. It may have been his first and only offense; but no matter, he is a law-breaker. And now he is seized by the officers of the law, and taken into court, where, the facts being set forth, the law shows him to be guilty, and he is condemned to death. But sentence will not be executed for several weeks, and what is done with Mr. A in the meantime? He is shut up in prison, possibly with chains on his limbs. Now what is it that holds him there? It is the law of the State. It was the law that seized him, condemned him, and shut him up in jail. The sheriff and the judge were merely the agents of the law. He is then indeed “under the law.” *SITI September 11, 1884, page 554.2*

And now Mr. A begins to realize his impending doom, and longs for freedom. How can he get it? The walls of his cell are impenetrable, the doors are securely bolted, and he is chained to the floor. It is very clear that he cannot help himself. Who can? There is only one man, and that is the governor. To him he turns as his only hope. He cannot plead the many good deeds that he may have done, for they do not destroy the fact that he has sinned. It was past transgression that brought him into his present condition. He can only promise obedience for the future, and beg for mercy. Through the mediation of powerful friends, and the clemency of the governor, he at last obtains his freedom. *SITI September 11, 1884, page 554.3*

Now how is it in the case of the transgressor against God’s law? There is no hope of escaping, for the law is omnipresent, and as soon as the sin is committed it seizes the unfortunate one. “The wages of sin is death,” and since he is clearly a sinner, he is condemned already. Hence he is immediately “shut up.” He cannot bribe the jailer, and he has nothing to expect but death. He casts about for a way to escape from his bondage, but every scheme which he devises fails. One hope alone appears, and that is Christ. He has promised to rescue all who believe in him, and the unhappy sinner, believing that Christ is able “to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him,” lays hold on the hope thus held out, and becomes a free man. Now Paul says that before faith came we were all “under the law, shut up,” in just the condition above described. It is not merely the Jews, not a certain few, who are shut up under condemnation of the law, but all men in all ages of the

world's history have been in just that condition. As soon as any one exercised faith in Christ, he obtained his freedom.*SITI September 11, 1884, page 554.4*

The verses that we first referred to, the 24th and 25th, are thus explained; but few more words are needed. As a consequence of the previous statements, the apostle concludes: "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith." In *verses 21, 22*, the apostle anticipates this verse by showing how absolutely necessary the law is to the carrying out of the promises of God through Christ. See the comments on those verses in the preceding part of this article. Notice that the law does not point to Christ-that office is intrusted to something else-but it brings us, yea, drives and forces us to him as our only hope. And this is just what was done by the individual who is called in our version a "schoolmaster." The proper term would be "pedagogue," a word applied anciently not to one who taught children, but to one who accompanied them to the place where they might be taught, and beat them if they ran away. Of course the law does not bring those who do not wish relief; but when sinners want liberty, and begin to struggle for it, the law allows them no avenue of escape except Christ, who is the "end of the law." It stands as an impossible wall, in whatever way the sinner may turn for escape, until he sees Christ, the Door across whose portals the law throws no bar.*SITI September 11, 1884, page 554.5*

"But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." *Verse 25*. No; the moment that we implicitly believe that Christ loves us individually, with a love that is able to save us, we are free. The chains that bind us to the body of death are severed, and "there is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." We are now new creatures in Christ, and must henceforth walk in newness of life, no longer "under the law," but "under grace."*SITI September 11, 1884, page 554.6*

We would like to carry these thoughts still further, but this article is already too long. In our next we shall finish our consideration of the term "under the law," and will then pass to some other phases of the law question. E. J. W.*SITI September 11, 1884, page 554.7*

September 18, 1884

“The Sabbath-School” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—OCT. 11

1. What is the meaning of the word “immortal”? *SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.1*
2. What is the appointed lot of mankind? *Hebrews 9:27.SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.2*
3. Are any exempt from death? *Romans 5:12.SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.3*
4. Then can it be that any of the human race are immortal? *SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.4*
5. What exhortation did Paul give to Timothy? *1 Timothy 6:12.SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.5*
6. Until what time did he charge Timothy to keep this commandment? *Verses 13, 14.SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.6*
7. What did he say that Christ in his times should show? *Verse 15.SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.7*
8. What did he say further concerning this “blessed and only Potentate?” *Verse 16.SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.8*
9. Who is this “blessed and only Potentate” here referred to? *SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.9*
10. Then who alone is possessed of immortality? *SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.10*
11. Does Christ share this attribute equally with the Father? *John 5:26.SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.11*

12. What contrast as the apostle Paul institute between God and man? *Romans 1:23.SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.12*
13. What is the meaning of the words “corruptible” and “incorruptible”? *SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.13*
14. Since God only hath immortality, what term must be applied to man? *Job 4:7.SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.14*
15. Who has eternal life to bestow? *Romans 6:23.SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.15*
16. Through whom may it be obtained? *Ib.SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.16*
17. To what class of persons will it be given? *Romans 2:7.SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.17*
18. If men have immortality, would they be exhorted to seek for it? *SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.18*
19. How are we to seek for it? *Romans 2:7.SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.19*
20. Then if none get it but those who seek for it, what can you say of those who do evil? *SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.20*
21. Who is it that has brought immortality to light? *2 Timothy 1:10.SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.21*
22. By what means is it presented to mankind? *Ib.SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.22*
23. Then where are we to seek for immortality? *SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.23*
24. What can you say of those who do not accept the gospel? *SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.24*

The definition which Webster gives of the word “immortal” is this: “Not mortal; exempt from liability to die; and dying; the imperishable; lasting forever; having unlimited existence.” To say,

then, that any being is immortal, is equivalent to saying that he cannot die. This will be the case with the redeemed saints, for Christ says: "But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; *neither can they die anymore*, for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." *Luke 20:35, 36*. When they obtain the resurrection from the dead, they are immortal, for they cannot die any more. But they did die once, and therefore they were not always immortal. And so Paul says that "it is appointed unto men once to die" (*Hebrews 9:27*), and that "death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." *Romans 5:12*. To say, then, that the Scriptures teach that men are by nature immortal, is to say that words have no meaning. Death is the appointed lot of mankind; and there only two men (Enoch and Elijah) who have been favored above their fellows, in that they did not see death. *SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.25*

In *1 Timothy 6:12* Paul gives the exhortation to "fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life." If we are already in possession of immortality, it would be impossible for us to heed this exhortation, for we could not "lay hold on" that which we already held; and no matter how earnestly we might fight the good fight of faith, it would have no effect on our immortality, if we already possessed it. Immortality is absolute; no man can be more than immortal. But in the thirteenth and fourteenth verses the apostle says that this charge must be kept until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ. From that we learn that we are to continue the fight of faith until the Lord comes; and since it is by that means that we lay hold on eternal life, we must also conclude that the eternal life will not be gained until that time. *SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.26*

The apostle goes on to say that Christ will show who is "the blessed and only potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; who only hath immortality." The reference here can be to no other than to God himself. Nothing, then, can be plainer than this statement that God alone has immortality. That is, he has "life in himself" (*John 5:26*). Immortality is an attribute of God, just the same as infallibility, omniscience, omnipotence. Christ, as the Son of God, possesses the same attributes, and is therefore equal with God and worthy to

be called God. But man has no more right to claim one attribute of God than all; he may as well put himself on a level with God in respect of knowledge, as to claim equality with respect to life. The simple fact is, as the text shows, that God alone possesses immortality; and therefore if man ever gets it, it must be as a gift from God.*SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.27*

The distinction between God and man is clearly defined thought the Bible. Paul, in showing the depth to which they even have fallen, says that they “changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man.” *Romans 1:23*. This might with equal propriety be translated: “Changed the glory of the immortal God into an image made like to mortal man.” In *Job 4:17* the question is asked, “Shall mortal man be more just than God?” In *Isaiah 51:12*, the Lord, through the prophets, asked: “Who art thou, that thou shouldst be afraid of a man that shall die, and of the son of man which shall be made as grass?” In contradistinction to this, God is ever were spoken of as “the living God,’ that is, the one who ever lived, who can never die. If man were possessed of immortality, then he might with propriety have the same titles applied to him that are applied to God.*SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.28*

“For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life to Jesus Christ our Lord.” *Romans 6:23*. Here we have the statement that eternal life comes alone from God, and the additional fact that it comes only through Christ. In *Romans 2:7* we learn still farther that God will give it only to them who “seek” for it, by patient continuance in well-doing. And in *2 Timothy 1:10* we learn that we are to seek for it in the gospel. The apostle says the Christ has “brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.” From these three texts we are forced to the following conclusions: No sinner can have eternal life, for “the wages of sin is *death*.” No one can have eternal life unless he *seeks for* it, and the proper way to seek for it is by patient continuance in well-doing. Again; since it is only through the gospel that immortality is brought to light, and eternal life comes only through Christ, it is evident that no one who rejects Christ and the gospel can have immortality.*SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.29*

It may be argued by some that, while it is true that immortality comes from God alone, and he alone has life in himself, he has implanted it in all human beings. But this will not harmonize with the Bible. If men were *by nature* immortal, then it would not be true that immortality, comes through Christ and the gospel. If we accept the Bible as authority, then immortality cannot be bestowed until it is seen who have accepted Christ, and have persevered in well-doing. And this cannot be seen in this life, for there is always a possibility of the best man's falling from his steadfastness. And still further, if it be true that all men have in them an immortal principle, then there can be no such thing as sin. For immortality means exemption from death. Whoever is immortal cannot die. But "the wages of sin is death;" that is, whoever sins will die; and no one will die except those who sin. Now, then, if we claim that all men are immortal, and that none can die, the logical conclusion is that none are sinners. In other words, wages will be given where due; and if death, the wages of sin, is given to no man, then it follows that no man is deserving of it. Thus immortal-soulism is pure universalism.*SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.30*

The following extracts from standard commentaries will be read with interest, and will show that the conclusions which we have drawn from the texts used in the lesson, are warranted by the best scholarship.*SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.31*

On 1 Timothy 6:16 Olshausen says: "Who only hath immortality.' He is therefore the source of immortality to all who are partakers in it; out of him is *death*."*SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.32*

Dean Alford quotes Justin Martyr as follows: "God is said only to have immortality, because he hath it not by the will of another, as the rest who possess it, but by his own proper essence."*SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.33*

Dr. Bloomfield says: "*ho monos echon athanasian*,' i.e., immortality self-derived; by which it is implied that he alone can confer it."*SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.34*

Dr. Barnes says: "Who only hath immortality.' The word here-*athanasia*-properly means *exemption from death*, and seems to mean that God, in his own nature, enjoys a perfect and certain

exemption from death. Creatures have immortality only as they derive it from him, and of course are dependent on him for it.”*SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.35*

On *Romans 5:12* Dean Alford says: “Literally ‘on ground of,’ ‘on condition that,’ which meaning, if rightly applied, suits the case in hand. *Life* depended on a certain conditions, viz., obedience; *death*, but on another, viz., disobedience. Mankind have disobeyed; the condition of deaths and entrances and diffusion has been fulfilled; death extended to all men, as a consequence of the fact that all have sinned.”*SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.36*

On *Romans 2:7* Dr. Barnes has the following: “The word *immortality* means that which is not corruptible, where subject to decay. It is applied to Heaven as a state where there will be no decay or death, in strong contrast with our present condition, where all things are corruptible, and soon vanish away. These expressions are undoubtedly descriptive of state of things beyond the grave.... ‘Eternal life.’ That is, God will ‘render’ eternal life to those who ‘seek’ it in this manner.”*SITI September 18, 1884, page 566.37*

“Shaking of the Powers of Heaven” The Signs of the Times, 10, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

A subscriber asks a question concerning the shaking of the powers of the heavens, spoken of in *Matthew 24:29*. In the Sabbath-school lesson, as he says, the idea was conveyed that this is to take place in connection with the coming of the Lord, and is not one of the signs of that coming. We give the substance of his query below:—*SITI September 18, 1884, page 569.1*

“In three of the Gospels, where events seem to be named in their proper order, so far as they have been fulfilled, the ‘shaking’ is made to precede his coming. Now can it be proved that the ‘shaking,’ of *Matthew 24:29* and the passing away of the heavens (*2 Peter 3:10*), are identical? May not this prediction of our Saviour be fulfilled in the disastrous storms of the present time, or in the great conflagrations upon the sun’s surface, as is evident from the sun spots, or in the perihelion disturbances of the solar system, or in all

these combined? May not this prophecy be double in its signification, and be fulfilled before his coming, and again in connection with that event.”*SITI September 18, 1884, page 569.2*

ANSWER.-In *Hebrews 12:25-27* we read: “For if they escaped not who refused Him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from Heaven; whose voice then shook the earth; but now hath he promised, saying, yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven. And this word, Yet once more, signifies the removing of those things that are shaken,” etc. From this we learn that as the voice of God at Sinai shook the earth, so *once more* it will shake both earth and heaven, and but once more. This then would preclude the possibility of there been two “shakings.”*SITI September 18, 1884, page 569.3*

The question then remains, when will the shaking occur? Peter says that in the day of the Lord “the heavens shall pass away with a great noise?” (*2 Peter 3:10*); the prophet says, “And the heavens departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places.” Here is the shaking of both earth and heaven; and it is in connection with Christ’s coming, for all the wicked hide themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains, and say to the mountains and rocks, “Fall on us and hide us from the face of Him that sitteth upon the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of his wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand?” *Revelation 6:14-17*.*SITI September 18, 1884, page 569.4*

We think our querist mistakes the meaning of the expression, “precede the coming of Christ.” Nothing can properly be called a “sign” of Christ’s coming except that which is given to show the nearness of that event, so that men may prepare for it. Those things that take place after the close of probation are not really signs of the coming, because there is then no need of them.*SITI September 18, 1884, page 569.5*

Again, the second coming of Christ, like the first, is an event covering a period of time. The whole time of Christ’s earthly ministry is called the first advent. There are many events then spoken of as

taking place when the Lord comes, such as the resurrection of “all that are in the graves” (*John 5:28*), the translation of the righteous, and the punishment of the wicked with everlasting destruction (*2 Thessalonians 1:7-9*). But we know that the resurrection of the wicked, and their final destruction does not take place until a thousand years after the translation of the righteous. We therefore say that the “second coming of Christ,” with all its attendant phenomena, is not an instantaneous event taking in simply the moment of his first appearing in the clouds of heaven, but one which, like his first advent, covers a period of time.*SITI September 18, 1884, page 569.6*

Of course the shaking of the powers of the heavens precedes the manifestation of Christ in the clouds, yet it occurs “in connection” with that event. And that is in the regular order of events as mentioned by the evangelists.*SITI September 18, 1884, page 569.7*

Concerning the storms, conflagrations on the sun, etc., we would say that they are not such events as would meet the requirements of *2 Peter 3:10* or *Revelation 6:14-16* and other passages. And as for “the perihelion disturbances of the solar system,” the worst result we have seen from the perihelion is the overwhelming lot of trash that has been published concerning it in certain would-be scientific journals. E. J. W.*SITI September 18, 1884, page 569.8*

“Under the Law. (Concluded.)” The Signs of the Times, 10, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

(Concluded.)

There is yet one more instance of the use of this term, and though the text is probably not so often quoted in opposition to the law of God as are the others, we will examine it, because it adds strength to the position that the law is unchangeable. In the fourth chapter of Galatians Paul continues the argument of chapter three. He starts out with the statement that the heir, so long as he is a child, must be under tutors and governors, even though he be lord of all. He cannot come into possession of his inheritance until he is of age. “Even so we,” says the apostle, “when we were children, were in

bondage under the elements of the world.” *Galatians 4:3.SITI September 18, 1884, page 569.9*

In this figure the child is used to represent the sinner before he accepts Christ. Until that time, as has been repeatedly shown from the Bible, every man is in bondage, in prison; we are at liberty only when we are in Christ. That the bondage here referred to is indeed the bondage of sin, may be seen by an examination of *verses 8 and 9*. In *verse 8* the apostle says: “Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods.” This language shows to whom Paul was writing. The members of the Galatian churches had been heathen, doing service to “them which by nature are no gods,” and not to the God who created all things; that is, before they knew the true God they worshiped idols. And Paul’s language to them will apply equally well to us, for, whether a man be brought up in a Christian or a heathen land, so long as he does not know God, he is virtually a heathen; he may not be a worshiper of images of wood or stone, but he has other gods before the one, true God. And no man who is not in Christ can know God, for Christ says: “No man cometh unto the Father but by me.” *John 14:6*. So then, although Paul addressed his words directly to those who had been idolaters in the commonly accepted sense of the word, they apply to all.*SITI September 18, 1884, page 569.10*

The apostle continues in *verse 9*: “But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?” To what were they once in bondage? To sin, for they had been practicing idolatry, with its accompanying vices, in direct violation of God’s law. Then sin, in its various forms, constitutes the “elements” under which they had been in bondage. It is justly termed “the elements of the world,” because it is of the earth, and not of Heaven. It is the same term which Paul uses when, in writing to the Colossians, he warns them not to be spoiled by “philosophy and vain deceit,” by the “tradition of men,” by the rudiments of the world.” *Colossians 2:8, 20*. They are weak in that they can give no liberty or peace even though they promise it (*2 Peter 2:19*); and the term “beggarly,” fitly expresses the despicable nature of sin.*SITI September 18, 1884, page 569.11*

We find, then, the same statement in *Galatians 4:3* that is made in *Romans 3:19*; *Galatians 3:22*, etc., namely that all the world are by nature in the bondage of sin, “under the law.” What next? “But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.” *Galatians 4:4, 5*. Whom did Christ come to redeem? “Them that were under the law.” Compare this with *1 Timothy 1:15*. “This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief;” and again this: “For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost” (*Luke 19:10*), and you can have no doubt as to the meaning of the term, “under the law.” The plan of salvation has no reference to any but to those who were “lost,” who were “sinners,” or, in other words, “under the law.” The name “Jesus” was given to Christ before his birth, because, the angel said, “he shall save his people from their sins.” *Matthew 1:21*. He saves us from nothing but sin and its penalty. *SITI September 18, 1884, page 569.12*

This point will be made still more clear when we consider the position Christ had to assume in order to accomplish our salvation from sin. The text under consideration (*Galatians 4:4*) says that he was “made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law.” That is, he had to put himself in the exact condition of those whom he would save. In *Hebrews 2:16* we read of Christ, “For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham.” The meaning is, as indicated by the marginal reading, that he came not to redeem angels but men. “Wherefore,” the apostle continues, “in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.” *Hebrews 2:17*. He was made “in all things” like those whom he came to redeem. *SITI September 18, 1884, page 569.13*

Some one may exclaim, “What! do you think that Christ was a sinner?” By no means; he was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin” (*Hebrews 4:15*); he was absolutely good, the embodiment of goodness, yet he was counted as a sinner. In no other way could he be made “in all things” like his brethren, for they were sinners. In proof of this we quote *2 Corinthians 5:21*: “For he

(God) hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” As a parallel to this read *Isaiah 53:6*: “All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him (Christ) the iniquity of us all.” He bore the sins of the world as though they were his own. If it were not so, he would not have died; for “the wages of sin is death.” None can die except those in whom sin is found; our sins were laid on Christ, and accounted as his; and so, although personally “he knew no sin,” he was made to suffer the penalty of the law as a transgressor. And herein is the unspeakable love of Christ, that the innocent should assume the crimes of the guilty, and die in his stead. It was because Christ had taken upon himself “the form of a servant,” that he became obedient unto death. Some have thought it nothing less than blasphemy to speak of Christ, the sinless one, as being made a sinner, and suffering the penalty for sin, but it is from this very thing that he derives his highest glory. We simply state the fact as we find it in the Bible. This is the unfathomable mystery which angels desire to look into, and which will to all eternity call forth the love and adoration of the redeemed hosts. *SITI September 18, 1884, page 569.14*

We think a careful reading of the above, together with many Scripture texts for which we have not space, will convince all that to say that one is “under the law” is equivalent to saying that he is subject to its penalty as a sinner. *Galatians 4:4, 5*, then, teaches the simple fact that in order to save those who, on account of having violated the law, were under the condemnation of death, Christ put himself in their place and suffered the penalty of the law. And what is the condition of those who are thus redeemed from under the law? They “receive the adoption of sons” (*Galatians 4:5, 6*); and in harmony with this, Paul says in the eighth of Romans that those who “walk not after the flesh,” but are led by the Spirit of God, are the sons of God. *SITI September 18, 1884, page 569.15*

Before leaving this text, we wish to apply it to the theory that the law of God was given solely to Jews, and that “under the law” means subject to the law; the theory that would make the law binding upon the Jews alone. If this theory be true, what is the result? Since Christ came to redeem only those who were under the law, it would follow that all the Jews will be redeemed, and no others. This would

be making salvation not only “of the Jews,” but for the Jews. This conclusion cannot be evaded. Christ came to save the “lost,” those who were “under the law.” Now none can be under the law, that is, transgressors of the law, but those to whom the law was given; and therefore if the law was given for none but the Jews, then none but the Jews will be saved. But this is not true, because Christ died for all. A man should think at least twice before he takes a position that not only contradicts the Bible but shuts him out from an interest in the plan of salvation. Christ died for those who were under the law; and that all men were under the law, is shown by the fact that “whosoever will,” may avail himself of the provisions of the gospel.*SITI September 18, 1884, page 569.16*

At the risk of making this article too long, we notice one more passage, which should be considered in this connection. It is *Galatians 3:13*: “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, cursed be every one that hangeth on a tree.” This is an exact parallel to *Galatians 4:4, 5*. Christ was made a curse, in order to redeem us from the curse. Now what was the curse which fell upon Christ? It was death, as the remainder of the verse shows: “For it is written, cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.” “The wages of sin is death.” Death is the curse which the law pronounces upon every transgressor; but from this Christ has delivered us (if we believe on him), by voluntarily becoming our substitute. Take this verse in connection with the preceeding: “And the law is not of faith; but the man that doeth them shall live in them.” The man that keeps the commandments of God shall live. See *Leviticus 18:5*. But no man has kept them; consequently the curse has fallen upon all. “Death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” *Romans 5:12*. From this curse we can be redeemed only by Christ. And the person thus redeemed from the curse must keep the law, or else he will again bring himself under the curse; for those only have life who keep the law.*SITI September 18, 1884, page 570.1*

In each of these texts that we have considered we are brought to the same point, namely, that Christ is our only hope of escape from the penalty of universal and immutable law. And knowing with what an inexorable grasp the law holds its victims, we can glory in the fact that Christ is “made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and

sanctification, and redemption.” E. J. W.*SITI* September 18, 1884,
page 570.2

October 2, 1884

“The Sabbath-School” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 37.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—OCT. 18

1. Upon what did Paul exhort Timothy to lay hold? *1 Timothy 6:12.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.1*
2. By what means was he to lay hold of it? *Ib.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.2*
3. Would it be consistent to exhort one to “lay hold” of the eternal life if he has it by nature? *SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.3*
4. To whom must we come in order to have life? *John 5:40.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.4*
5. For what purpose did Christ say he came? *John 10:10.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.5*
6. Then if men possess immortality by nature, did not Christ come in vain? *SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.6*
7. What is proved by the fact that he came to give life? *SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.7*
8. Who does Christ say have everlasting life? *John 3:36.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.8*
9. In what sense do we have it now? *2 Timothy 1:1.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.9*
10. In whose keeping is this gift? *1 John 5:11.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.10*
11. Can one do anything more for Christ than to give up everything for his sake? *SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.11*

12. What does Christ say that those who do so shall receive in this present time? *Mark 10:29, 30.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.12*

13. What shall they receive in the world to come? *Ib.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.13*

14. Then when will eternal life be enjoyed?*SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.14*

15. At what time will immortality be bestowed? *1 Corinthians 15:51-54.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.15*

16. How is it that we receive immortality? *Verses 52, 53.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.16*

17. Can a person “put on” that which he already has on?*SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.17*

18. Then what can you say as to man’s present possession of immortality?*SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.18*

19. What is due to Christ from all men? *John 5:23.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.19*

20. How much honor is due him? *Ib.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.20*

21. What does Christ alone have? *John 6:68.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.21*

22. Through whom does eternal life come? *Romans 6:23.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.22*

23. If men were by nature in possession of immortality, would they be dependent upon Christ for it?*SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.23*

24. Then is it not robbing Christ of the honor due him, to say that man possesses immortality whether they believe in him or not?*SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.24*

LESSON FOR OCTOBER 25

1. Concerning what did Paul wish the brethren not to be ignorant? *1 Thessalonians 4:13.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.25*
2. What is sleep often used to represent? *John 11:11-14; Psalm 13:3.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.26*
3. What is the condition of a man in a sound sleep?*SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.27*
4. Then what must we conclude as to the Bible idea of the condition of man in death?*SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.28*
5. In what place are the dead sleeping? *Daniel 12:2; Job 7:21.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.29*
6. What does Paul say that God will do for those who sleep in Jesus? *1 Thessalonians 4:14.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.30*
7. When will he do this? *Verses 15, 16.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.31*
8. From what place will he bring them? *John 5:28, 29.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.32*
9. In what sense, then, is it that God brings them “with him,” i.e. with Christ? *Hebrews 13:20.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.33*
10. Who are they who go into the grave? *Psalm 89:48.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.34*
11. What kind of a place is the grave? *Job 10:20-22.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.35*
12. How is it described by the psalmist? *Psalm 88:11, 12.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.36*
13. What does Solomon say as to the activity of those who go to the grave? *Ecclesiastes 9:10.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.37*
14. Are we to understand, then, that the dead are entirely unconscious? *Verse 5.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.38*

15. Do they not feel any of the emotions which sway the living? *Verse 6.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.39*

16. Are they not affected even by the success or adversity of their best loved ones? *Job 14:21.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.40*

17. If a tree is cut down, what may happen? *Job 14:7-9.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.41*

18. What is said of the death of man? *Verse 10.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.42*

19. How complete is the “wasting away” of man when he dies? *Verses 11, 12.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.43*

20. How long will it be before the dead shall be raised out of their sleep? *Verse 12.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.44*

21. When is it that the heavens shall pass away? *2 Peter 3:10.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.45*

22. Then at what time did Job locate the resurrection?*SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.46*

23. Where did he expect to stay while waiting for this event? *Job 14:13; 17:13.SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.47*

Since there was no paper last week, we this week print the questions for two Sabbaths, in order that those who are following the series may not lose the connection.*SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.48*

In *John 10:10* we have Christ’s statement of the object which brought him to earth to die: “I am come that they [believers in him] might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.” Compare this with his words in *John 3:16*. He came into the world to save sinners (*1 Timothy 1:15*); and since the wages of sin is *death*, it must follow that he gives life, as he says. And this statement cannot be turned aside from its literal meaning by saying, as Dr. Barnes does, that the word “abundantly” “denotes that which is not absolutely essential to *life*, but which is superadded to make

life happy;" for it is not merely the 'abundance' of life which he came to bestow, but *life* itself. "I am come *that they might have life*, and [something else] that they might have it more abundantly;" that is, to all eternity. But the fact that Christ came to give life, proves conclusively that we cannot have it without him, unless we are willing to admit that he came in vain-for a purpose wholly unnecessary. *SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.49*

The fact that life comes only through Christ is again and again repeated in the Bible. "He that believeth on the Son have everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." *John 3:36*. Here we have a most positive declaration; a plainer statement of the case could not be made. There are some, however, who misapply the first portion of the verse, and claim that even now, in this present life, Christians have the eternal life. But the beloved disciple, in repeating the words of Christ, says: "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." *1 John 5:11*. And this is how it is that "He that hath the Son hath life." We have it in Christ. It is not ours in the sense of actual possession, but by promise. See *2 Timothy 1:1; Titus 1:2*. *SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.50*

And when shall we receive this promise? Christ himself tells us. Said he: "There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel's, but he shall receive an hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions." This will be the portion of a follower of Christ in this world; but this is not all. He continues: "And in the world to come eternal life." *Mark 10:29, 30*. So the eternal life is ours in this world only by promise; in the world to come it will be ours in fact. But so surely does Christ give life, that if we have him, we may say that we have life. *SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.51*

One word of explanation on *John 3:36*. "He that hath not the Son shall not see life." Of course this can have no reference to this present life; it must refer to eternal life. That is the object for which man was created. This brief existence is but a preparation for eternal life. The Lord gives us a little period of time to see how we will use it. If we are faithful, he will at his coming give us that for

which he has designed us. But if we do not appreciate this life, if we are not faithful in that which is least, what object could there be for him to give us that which is greatest, eternal life? None at all. If we do not gain that, our lives will have been spent in vain. The wicked will “be as though they had not been” (*Obadiah 1:16*), and so it can be said of them that they do not see life. *SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.52*

The great reason that we urge why men should accept the doctrine of conditional immortality is that it honors Christ. If we say that we possess immortality by nature, we deprive Christ of his highest honor. We virtually make ourselves independent of him. “The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” *Romans 6:23*. Now if we claim immortality as ours by birthright, we may not deny the first part of this text, but we do the second. We may admit that immortality is the gift of God; but we must honor the Son even as we honor the Father. We must also admit that it comes only through Christ. *SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.53*

Few people realize it, but it is a fact that the doctrine that men are by nature immortal is really a denial of Christ. If Christ came to give life, and we claim to have it without him, do we not thus cast him off? Spiritualists have carried the doctrine of inherent, unconditional immortality to its legitimate conclusion, and openly repudiate Christ as a Saviour. If we hold the same doctrine, what warrant have we that we will not go to the same lengths as they? The doctrine of conditional immortality is the only safeguard against Spiritualism. Can anyone say that it is not a practical doctrine? *SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.54*

Having learned that man is mortal and possesses no principle of immortality until the coming of the Lord and the resurrection, when he puts on immortality, we would naturally conclude that the dead are unconscious, extinct. And so the Bible represents them. Sleep is a common symbol of death. David says that when Michael stands up, “many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake.” *Daniel 12:2*. Christ said when Lazarus was dead, “our friend Lazarus sleepeth.” *John 11:11-14*. David prays the Lord to remember him lest he “sleep the sleep of death.” *Psalms 13:3*. And Paul says of David after he had served his own generation, he “fell

on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption.” *Acts 13:36*. Sleep is thus defined by Webster: “A natural and healthy, but temporary and periodical, suspension of the functions of the organs of sense.” Of the verb he says: “To take rest by a suspension of the voluntary exercise of the powers of the body and mind, an apathy of the organs of sense; to become unconscious.” Sleep is a synonym for unconsciousness. When a man is in a perilous position and knows nothing of it, we say that he is asleep to his danger. So death, in order to be fitly represented by sleep must be a total suspension of the functions of the organs of sense, and of all the powers of body and mind. And such we shall find the Bible declares it to be. *SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.55*

The dead go to the grave. They are said to “sleep in the dust.” It is a place to which both good and bad go. This of itself would prove that men do not go to Heaven at death. The following description of the place of the dead also shows that it is not Heaven: “A land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is as darkness.” *Job 10:22*. It is the “land of forgetfulness.” *Psalms 88:12*. It is from this place that the Lord will bring his faithful ones when he comes. Paul says concerning them that sleep: “For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus shall God bring with him.” *1 Thessalonians 4:14*. This does not mean that he will bring them from Heaven, but from the grave. See *John 5:28, 29*. The apostle in *verse 14* has not yet introduced the coming of the Lord from Heaven. He has simply spoken of the death and resurrection of Christ. It was God who “brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ” (*Hebrews 13:20*), and if we believe in Jesus, he will bring us from the dead also, even as he did him. *SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.56*

But until the coming of the Lord, the dead remain in their graves, unconscious of passing the events. Read Solomon’s statements concerning them in *Ecclesiastes 9:5, 6, 10*. They “know not anything.” “There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave.” Even the prosperity or adversity of their best loved relatives, produces no emotion either of joy or sorrow. “His sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them.” *Job 14:21*. The utter

extinction of man in the grave is brought out in this fourteenth chapter of Job. If we cut a tree down, there will be enough life left in the stump to cause it to sprout again; "but man dieth, and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost, and where is he?" *Verse 10*. This is equivalent to saying that he has no existence. But this extension is not final; it lasts until a fixed time. "As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up; so man lieth down, and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." *Verses 11, 12*. We can here only refer to the texts which locate this time. Peter says (*chap. 3:10*) that in the day of the Lord the heavens shall pass away with a great noise. It is the voice of God, which at Sinai shook the earth, which is yet once more to sound, and shake the heavens. *Hebrews 12:26*. And this voice is (the trump of God) that is to arouse the sleeping dead. So Job's words are equivalent to the statement that at death man becomes utterly extinct, and remain so until the coming of the Lord. E. J. W. *SITI October 2, 1884, page 582.57*

"Is a State Religion Contemplated?" The Signs of the Times, 10, 37.

E. J. Waggoner

In the thirteenth chapter of Revelation two beasts are brought to view, representing two earthly powers. The first beast, having seven heads and ten horns, the body of a leopard, the feet of a bear, and the mouth of a lion, can be no other than the papal power, and so commentators have generally regarded it. It combines the characteristics of all the beasts of *Daniel 7*, showing that its dominion has extended over all of the territory occupied by the powers represented by those beasts, that is, nearly all of the Old World. It speaks great things and blasphemy; it blasphemes God and his name; it makes war with the saints and overcomes them, and continues forty-two months, or twelve hundred and sixty years, when it goes into captivity. All of these specifications are met in the papal power, and in no other. Its going into captivity was in A. D. 1798, when Pope Pius VI. was taken prisoner to France, and the papacy for two years had no head. This was indeed a deadly wound, which, however, in accordance with the prophecy, was healed by the enthronement of another pope, and the restoration of the papacy to at least the semblance of its former power. *SITI*

October 2, 1884, page 585.1

Just at this time “another beast” was “coming up but of the earth.” Since all of the Old World was already occupied, it is evident that we must look to the New World for the rise of this other power. In 1798, when the papacy went into captivity, the United States of America was just “coming up,” and there was no other power then establishing itself. The first president had, at that time, barely completed his term of service, and the eyes of the world were being tuned to this new nation, which was so rapidly and yet unostentatiously arising to take its place among the foremost nations of the earth. Its peaceable, lamb-like appearance has always been preserved, and even the dragon voice (*i.e.*, the persecuting disposition) has been heard to a slight degree. If space allowed, we might go on to show many more reasons why this two-horned beast must represent the United States. This much we can say, that if this beast does not symbolize the United States, then there is one symbol of prophecy for which no place can be found.*SITI October 2, 1884, page 585.2*

This power is to make an image to the first beast. That beast, the papacy, was simply an ecclesiastico-civil power,-a union of church and State. The State existed to serve the ends of the church, and to enforce its dogmas. The church itself never put heretics to death; it simply decided who were heretics, and then handed them over to the civil power, over which the church had supreme control, to be punished. An image to that beast must be something like it-another union of church and State. All that is required to effect such a union is for the civil power to enforce, under penalty, some practice which the religious leaders declare ought to be observed. This is just what must be done in the United States, if we are correct in our application of the prophecy. And this is what Seventh-day Adventists have for thirty years declared would be done in this country.*SITI October 2, 1884, page 585.3*

It is well known that for about twenty years a party has been in existence, known as the “National Reform Party,” whose avowed object is to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will “place all Christian laws, institutions, and usages on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the

land.” To show that this movement contemplates “sufficiently practical ends,” the leaders make no secret of the fact that the observance of Sunday is one of the “Christian institutions” which they desire to see enforced by the laws of the State, declaring that when the desired amendment shall be obtained, no one who violates the Sunday shall be eligible to any office. They openly declare, also, that the State should exist only as the servant of the church, to carry out its decrees. When, therefore, a national Sunday law shall have become an actual fact, the image to be papal beast will be fairly set up in the United States.*SITI October 2, 1884, page 585.4*

The New York *Independent* has been very outspoken against such a movement as this. Although advocating the observance of Sunday as the Sabbath, it has deprecated any attempt to make such observance compulsory. We will quote from its pages to show that we are not alone in regarding legal enactments for the observance of Sunday as a union of church and State. The reader will please bear in mind that in these quotations the word “Sabbath” is used for Sunday. In its issue of Dec. 14, 1882, in an article concerning “Sunday laws,” the *Independent* said:-*SITI October 2, 1884, page 585.5*

“There is no doubt that much of the earlier Sabbath legislation of this country, the relics of which still remain to some extent in the law, and to a larger extent in the minds of some of the earnest advocates for the sanctity of the Sabbath, was based upon the principle of a State religion, and that Christianity, with its Sabbath, was that religion. This theory, however, has been thoroughly exploded by judicial decisions in later and wiser times; and it cannot stand a moment without surrendering the fundamental principles upon which the American governments are organized. The State has nothing to do with the Christian Sabbath as a religious day, except to protect from improper disturbance those who, on religious grounds, keep it as holy time. It has no right to pass to the breadth of a hair beyond this point, any more than it has to enact a doctrine of God or the Trinity, which the people shall believe. The moment the State exceeds protection, and undertakes the work of direction, it becomes a trespasser upon the rights of conscience, and assumes a function for which it is not adapted, and for which it has

no warrant. The State has no right to compel a man to treat the first day of the week as 'holy time.' Whether he shall do so or not is for him to determine, and not for the State to determine for him." *SITI October 2, 1884, page 585.6*

To all of this we give our consent; we believe it is in accordance with sound reason and strict justice. In its next issue, that of Dec. 21, 1882, the *Independent* says further:-*SITI October 2, 1884, page 585.7*

"The State has nothing to do with Sunday as a purely religious day, or with the reasons which demand and enforce its observance as such a day. Its sole function is to regulate it as a rest day, and that, too, for reasons that apply equally to all the people, and not particularly to Christians, who keep it as 'holy time.' Christians have an unquestionable right so to keep the day, and by moral means to persuade others to keep it in the same way, and to be fully protected in so doing; but they have no right to demand that the State shall compel others to adopt either their creed or their practice in regard to the religious sanctity of the Sabbath. It should be enough for them if the State, for its own reasons, and not theirs as religionists, makes Sunday a rest day within the limits of a reasonable propriety. When they ask the State to do more, they virtually ask it to establish a *State religion*." *SITI October 2, 1884, page 585.8*

The *Independent* seems to be a little confused in this quotation, in that it says that the function of the State is to regulate Sunday as a rest day. But whatever it may mean by that statement, it is clear enough when it says that Christians have no right to ask the State to compel others to adopt either their *creed* or their *practice* in respect to the religious sanctity of the Sunday. So long as the State does not seek to compel us to adopt the *practice* of the majority of professed Christians in regard to Sunday, we care not how much it legislates concerning it. To say that the State has no right to compel anyone to adopt their *practice* in regard to Sunday, is equivalent to saying that it shall not *compel* anyone to rest on that day. In this it is correct, as it is also in the statement that such compulsion would be the establishment of a State religion. Again, in its issue of Dec. 28, 1882, in an editorial on "The Sabbath and Railroads," it says:-*SITI*

October 2, 1884, page 585.9

“We would resist to the very last any attempt to put the civil statute behind the Sabbath [Sunday] as a religious institution, since this cannot be done without involving in principle the whole doctrine of religion and State. It is, however, not less a duty of the church, and of Christians in their individual capacity, to do what the State cannot properly do, and, therefore, should not do; and that is to enforce the Sabbath as a sacredly religious day, and by moral means, by example, and by precept.”*SITI October 2, 1884, page 585.10*

With this we have no fault to find. We do not question the right of Christians, *as individuals*, to enforce the observance of Sunday by example and by precept, nor of anybody to keep the Sunday of their own free will. What we do protest against is a State religion,-the compelling of individuals to rest on Sunday against their will.*SITI October 2, 1884, page 586.1*

But since 1882 the *Independent* has undergone a radical change, and now approves what it once condemned. The issue of Aug. 28, 1884, contains an editorial on “The Working Man’s Interest in the Day of Rest,” in which it says that all legislation which *allows any work* to be performed on Sunday is a failure, and they move to deprive the laborer of his right. This wrong to the working man, it says, can be relieved by nothing but the religious observance of the day. From this article we quote a few paragraphs:-*SITI October 2, 1884, page 586.2*

“The net result [*i.e.*, of laws which *permit* any person to labor on Sunday] is to put more terror into toil, and to add so much more of burden to the existence of a class of people whose life is already hard enough, and who, without the powerful arm of the law and of social custom to protection, are unable to vindicate themselves.*SITI October 2, 1884, page 586.3*

“There is no secular nor semi-secular theory of the day that can meet this abuse. If it is handed over to the amusement, money-making enterprise will only lay itself out on that day in another way, and drive its wheels and push its methods so much the harder as the time is shorter.*SITI October 2, 1884, page 586.4*

“The only possible protection lies in *supporting by law* and by social observance the *religious character* of the day. In the name of religion a halt may be called, and the weary to be ended. Religion is rest in peace. It is still and recuperative to the body and mind. It keeps a people in their homes, and engages them in a wholesome thought, and it speaks in the name of an authority which is sacred enough to rise superior to the pressing claims and urgency of business.” *SITI October 2, 1884, page 586.5*

It then states that the right of the laborer to his rest holds good for domestics, for coachmen and stable-boys, in the railway and the steamer, as well as in mills and manufactories, and says further:-*SITI October 2, 1884, page 586.6*

“It is a right on whose recognition the religious observance of Sunday depends. If Christian people will not consent to some sacrifice in matters like these, they cannot hope to retain the great boon to themselves and to the world around them of a religious state. If they consider that price too high, they cannot have their jewel of a well-kept Sabbath.” *SITI October 2, 1884, page 586.7*

The article closes with these words. “A religious Sunday gives the only hope a weary world can have a regular day of rest.” *SITI October 2, 1884, page 586.8*

We do not give these quotations in order to take the *Independent* to task for its change of base; that is its own affair, not ours. But we give them to show how public sentiment is shaping. When the strongest opponent of the “National Reform” movement, the most influential popular religious journal of the country, favors that movement, it indicates no little progress toward the end sought by that party. That that end is in reality a union of church and State, no thinking person, least of all the *Independent*, can deny. The agents of the so-called Reform Party are not idle, and the prejudice which they have to overcome is only nominal. The friends of the Sunday feel that something must be done since there is no divine command for Sunday observance, nothing by which they can appeal to the conscience of the people, Sunday desecration is increasing rapidly. In their desperation they see no remedy but to adopt a plan which, as the *Independent* says, is the surrender of the fundamental

principle upon which the American government is based.*SITI October 2, 1884, page 586.9*

The student of prophecy and of the signs of the times can see clearly that the time is near it hand when the people of the earth will respond with alacrity to the demand “that they should make an image to the beast which had the wound by the sword, and did live.” When that time comes, may we be found among those who are heeding the command from Heaven, to “worship Him that made Heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.” E. J. W.*SITI October 2, 1884, page 586.10*

October 9, 1884

“The Sabbath-School” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 38.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—OCT. 25

1. When King Hezekiah was sick, what message came to him from the Lord? *Isaiah 38:1.SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.1*
2. When he received this message, what did he do? *Verse 2.SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.2*
3. How did he feel at the prospect of death? *Verse 3.SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.3*
4. In answer to his prayer, what did the Lord promise? *Verse 5.SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.4*
5. When he had recovered, what reason did he give for the sorrow he manifested? *Verses 9, 10.SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.5*
6. Of what did he say he was about to be deprived?*SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.6*
7. What do you conclude from that statement?*SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.7*
8. What further reason did Hezekiah give for his sorrow at the prospect of death? *Verse 11.SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.8*
9. Where does the Lord dwell? *Psalm 11:4; 33:13, 14.SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.9*
10. Then if Hezekiah had gone to Heaven, would he not have seen the Lord?*SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.10*
11. What had been the character of Hezekiah? *Isaiah 38:3; 2 Kings 18:1-6.SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.11*

12. Then what must we conclude from his statement that if he died he should not see the Lord? *SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.12*

13. To what place had Hezekiah expected to go if his life was cut short? *Isaiah 38:10.SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.13*

14. Was it simply his body that was about to go into the grave? *Verse 17.SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.14*

15. What did he give as the final reason for not desiring to die? *Verse 18.SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.15*

16. Who alone can praise the Lord? *Verse 19.SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.16*

17. How positively does David speak on this point? *Psalms 150:1.SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.17*

18. Why is it that men who have praised God all their lives cease to do so at death? *Psalms 6:5.SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.18*

19. Why do they so soon forget God? *Psalms 146:3, 4.SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.19*

20. If their thoughts perish, how much to the dead know? *Ecclesiastes 9:5.SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.20*

The texts quoted in our lesson this week are so clear that scarcely any comment is needed. The interesting story of Hezekiah's sickness and recovery is presented to us, and certain doctoral lessons are drawn therefrom. These cannot be misunderstood by any who study the text. We would notice, in the first place, the popular fallacy that peace of mind in view of death is a sure test of piety, and a token that all is well with the departing one. We are told concerning the wicked that "there are no bands in their death; but their strength is firm" (*Psalms 73:4*); and in the lesson we find that righteous Hezekiah "wept sore" when he heard that he must soon die. While all good persons do not express deep sorrow, as did Hezekiah, we have no example in the Bible of one who expressed anything like joy at the prospect of death. Without exception, the Bible writers looked upon death as something to be dreaded. It is

represented as an enemy; and Solomon could find no better example of cruelty than the grave: "Cruel as the grave." Cant. 8:6. Why, then, should it not be feared?*SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.21*

The modern popular ideas of death are all upset by the statements of the Bible. We are taught that death is a friend, and that "'tis but the voice that Jesus sends to call us to his arms." If this were true, death would indeed be a friend; but it is positively false. Hezekiah's grief was entirely consistent with his previous upright and godly life, for, said he, "I shall not see the Lord, even the Lord, in the land of the living." "For the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth." Instead of death being the voice of Jesus, calling his loved ones to his arms, it is the cruel weapons of Satan, with which he seeks to destroy the human race, and deprive them of all happiness and good.*SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.22*

"I said in the cutting off of my days, I shall go to the gates of the grave; I am deprived of the residue of my years." *Isaiah 38:10*. Even if it were true that good men go to Heaven as soon as they die, this language shows plainly that Hezekiah knew nothing of any such doctrine. He regarded death as the cutting off of his days, the deprivation of the residue of his years, and not a lengthening of his existence to all eternity. The language that he used is utterly inconsistent with the idea of continued existence after death.*SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.23*

Without doubt many whose attention is specially called to the chapter relating the story of Hezekiah's illness and recovery, will query in regard to the sign that was given him by the Lord. We have no explanation to offer; we do not think that one is needed. There are some who think to rid the sign of the appearance of a miracle by saying that the shadow went backward on account of the extraordinary refraction of the sun's rays. They do not seem to think that this would also require miraculous interposition. For our part, it is no more difficult to believe that God could, if necessary, move the sun itself backward, than to believe that he could cause it to stand still, or created it in the beginning. We have no sympathy with that spirit which attempts to bring the acts of an infinite God within the

comprehension of a finite mind. That which is necessary for us to understand,-our duty to God and our fellows, and the blessings promised to the obedient, are clearly set forth in the word. To these things we should give earnest and reverent heed, and pray the Lord to increase our faith. E. J. W. *SITI October 9, 1884, page 596.24*

“Seventh-day Keepers and the Teaching of the Apostles” The Signs of the Times, 10, 38.

E. J. Waggoner

The above is the heading of a short article which appeared in the *Advance* not long ago, and which a subscriber wishes us to notice, as it is being circulated quite extensively, and is considered by many to be a fatal blow to the teachings of Seventh-day Adventists. It is, perhaps, unnecessary to state that the “Teaching of the Apostles” does not refer to that found in the New Testament, but to a recently discovered document bearing that title. We will give the *Advance’s* article entire, and then proceed to make such comments as may seem necessary. We will first say, however, by way of preface, that the number of Sabbath-keeping churches, ministers, and people, as given by the *Advance* is too small. *SITI October 9, 1884, page 599.1*

“The Seventh-day keepers in this country, composed of Adventists and Baptists, number 761 churches, 270 ministers, and 25,780 members; and they claim to be rapidly increasing. The Adventists are much larger body. The recently discovered ‘Teaching of the Twelve Apostles’ will sooner or later weaken, or annihilate, the view that the seventh day is still the sacred one of the week. Its fourteenth chapter begins thus: ‘But on the Lord’s day do ye assemble and break bread, and give thanks, after confessing your transgressions, in order that your sacrifice may be pure.’ This is a direction to observe the Lord’s supper on the Lord’s day. Was that day the seventh or the first day of the week? Much depends upon the answer. First, all must admit, according to *Acts 20:7*, that disciples at Troas, with the apostle Paul, assembled on the first day of the week to ‘break bread,’ to observe the Lord’s supper; and that they chose the first day of the week out of the whole seven during which they were there together. *SITI October 9, 1884, page 599.2*

“Second, all admit, who know the case, that, according to Justin Martyr, a reliable witness, the Christians were accustomed to hold religious services and observe the Lord’s supper, on Sunday of each week, which was the first day, called ‘Sunday’ by Justin, because that was the Roman name, and he was addressing the Roman Emperor and Senate.*SITI October 9, 1884, page 599.3*

“Two things, then, are fixed: First, that the primitive Christians of the apostolic age observed the Lord’s supper on the first day of the week; second, it is fixed by the ‘Teaching of the Twelve Apostles’ that that first day was the ‘Lord’s day.’ As a deduction, a third thing is fixed, that the apostle John, when he said he ‘was in the spirit on the Lord’s day,’ meant that it was on the first day of the week. The day bearing the sacred name of the Lord Jesus was certainly the *sacred* day at that time. This all agrees with a great amount of other evidence, too much to be here presented. It all tends strongly to make keepers of the seventh change their observance to the first day, and to make keepers of the first day more confident of their position than heretofore.”*SITI October 9, 1884, page 599.4*

But very little mention has been made in the SIGNS concerning this so-called “Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,” and we will therefore state a few facts in order that our readers may know the truth of the matter, and understand just how much effect it has on the teaching of Seventh-day Adventists. We are the more anxious to do this because the “Teaching” has been widely circulated, and has received an immense amount of attention from religious journals since its discovery. Indeed its discovery has created a great furor in the religious world. The New York *Independent* regard it as “by all odds the most important writing, exterior to the New Testament, now in the possession of the Christian world;” and many other journals and teachers regard it as inferior to the New Testament. It is very certain that since the “Teaching” was discovered, religious journals have devoted more attention to it than they commonly do to the Bible itself.*SITI October 9, 1884, page 599.5*

The document itself is a portion of a Greek manuscript that was discovered in the monastery of the Most Holy Sepulchre, in Constantinople, by Philotheos Bryennios, bishop of Nicomedia. Of course it is not claimed even by the most enthusiastic supporters of

the “Teaching” that it was written by the apostles themselves. Learned men are divided in their opinion as to a date, some placing it as early as the beginning of the second century, and others claiming that it was composed no earlier than the third or fourth century. In the absence of any positive proof for a date, and to save controversy, we are willing to grant that it was written at the earliest date claimed for it, in the second century.*SITI October 9, 1884, page 599.6*

The first question that will now rise in the minds of many will be, “Why should we take this document as an exponent of the belief and teaching of the apostles, rather than the writings of the apostles themselves?” And such a question would be very pertinent. It seems far more reasonable that we should go to the well authenticated writings of the apostles, to find their doctrine, than that we should appeal to the production of some unknown writer who did not even live contemporaneously with them. If I wish to become acquainted with the teachings of John Wesley, I go to his own works, instead of taking up what some anonymous writer may have said concerning his doctrine. So we should go to the New Testament to ascertain what was the “teaching” of the apostles. The whole affair looks as though there was a case to be sustained that could not be sustained by an appeal to the real teaching of the apostles.*SITI October 9, 1884, page 599.7*

But before we proceed further to impeach a witness, we will hear his testimony. The fourteenth chapter entire is as follows:-*SITI October 9, 1884, page 599.8*

“Coming together on the Lord’s day break bread and give thanks, confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. And let no one who has a dispute with his fellow approach with you until they be reconciled, lest your sacrifice be profane, for this is the sacrifice spoken of by the Lord: In every place and time bring to me a clean sacrifice, for I am a great king said the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the nations.”*SITI October 9, 1884, page 599.9*

It will be noticed that no clue is here given as to what day is referred to by the term “Lord’s day.” That most important matter is left out entirely. How, then, can this passage be made to do service in the

Sunday cause? Easily enough; all that has to be done is to *assume* that the day here referred to is Sunday, and presto, the thing is accomplished, and we have “strong evidence” to prove that Sunday is the Sabbath. Concerning this assumption as made in the quotation from the *Advance*, we shall speak hereafter; we are at present dealing only with the “Teaching” itself. *SITI October 9, 1884, page 599.10*

Thus far, then, we have found that the so-called “Teaching,” whether genuine or otherwise, affords not the slightest real testimony in favor of Sunday observance; the “evidence” has to be assumed. But this is not all. We have before us, not only the English translation of the “Teaching,” but the Greek text itself. We therefore know whereof we affirm when we say that the word for “day,” namely, *hemera*, does not once occur in the entire chapter. Neither is there any word corresponding to it, nor anything to indicate that the word “day” should be supplied. Why, then, was that word supplied by the translators? We leave the reader to answer that question to his own satisfaction. We have no fears, however, that any intelligent seventh-day keeper will change to the first day on the strength of so palpable and weak a forgery as this. *SITI October 9, 1884, page 599.11*

When the lawyer told the judge that he could give fifty good reasons for his client’s absence from court, the first of which was that the man was dead, the judge decided that it was unnecessary to produce the other forty-nine. So we might leave the matter here, having shown that the “Teaching” cannot affect seventh-day keepers in the least, because it contains no hint concerning rest on any day of the week. But we wish to pay our respects to the document a little further, now that we are on the subject. Inasmuch, however, as it has not the slightest connection with seventh-day keepers either to uphold or to contradict their teaching and practice, we shall drop the first part of our heading, and pursue the subject farther under the simple heading, “The Teaching of the Apostles.” E. J. W. *SITI October 9, 1884, page 599.12*

October 16, 1884

“The ‘Teaching of the Apostles’” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 39.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we found that “evidence” from this document in favor of Sunday-keeping proves to be no evidence at all, being nothing but a stupid forgery that is of itself indefinite. We wish to call the reader’s attention still further to chapter fourteen of the “Teaching,” in order to prove our statement made last week, that there is nothing in the passage which requires the insertion of the word “day.” For this purpose we once more quote the chapter:-*SITI October 16, 1884, page 617.1*

“Coming together on the Lord’s day break bread and give thanks, confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. And let no one who has a dispute with this fellow approach with you until they be reconciled, lest your sacrifice be profane, for this is the sacrifice spoken of by the Lord: In every place and time bring to me a clean sacrifice, for I am a great king said the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the nations.”*SITI October 16, 1884, page 617.2*

Now if this document is to be accepted as embodying the correct teaching of the apostles, it must be accepted as a whole. As soon as we discriminate against any portion, as being incorrect, we throw discredit upon the whole. If the above references is to be taken as proof that the apostles observed the first day of the week, and thus mark out our duty for us, it also proves just as conclusively that they partook of the communion every Sunday, and that all Christians should do likewise. The fact that those who laud the “Teaching” the most highly do not follow its injunction in this respect, is proved that they do not attach any real value at all to the document. They will follow it just so far as it seems to support their preconceived opinion; and they find it very convenient to have even a forgery to which to appeal in support of the practices which they are determined to follow.*SITI October 16, 1884, page 617.3*

It will be asked, “If you throw out the term ‘Lord’s day,’ what word or words should be supplied to make the sense complete?” Read the

passage once more carefully, and you will see. Of what does it treat? Of the Lord's Supper, and that alone. And what is there in connection with that ordinance, of which it would be proper to say to any individual, "You must not approach it"? The table. And the Greek word for table agrees exactly with the adjective *kuriakeen*. Now read again: "Coming together to the Lord's table, break bread and give thanks, confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. And let no one who has a dispute with his fellow approach [the Lord's table] with you until they be reconciled." This makes the passage consistent with itself, and also in harmony with the *real* teaching of the apostles. *SITI October 16, 1884, page 617.4*

Thus much for the "Lord's day" evidence. It has vanished into nothingness. Having shown this conclusively, we will now state that even if the "Teaching" did contain the expression "Lord's day," and that many times repeated, and even if it expressly stated that Sunday was the Lord's day, and contained a positive command for its observance, it would have no effect whatever on seventh-day keepers, for the simple reason that such a command would conflict with the Bible. We will also say that we are very much surprised at the modesty of those who made the translation (?) from which we have quoted. It is a marvel to us why they did not make the "Teaching" state positively that the first day of the week is the Lord's day, and should be secretly kept. Such testimony as that would have had great weight with many, and could have been used very effectively to deceive the wary. If we are going to commit a forgery, we would do it in such a manner that it would count for as much as possible. *SITI October 16, 1884, page 617.5*

And now as to the authenticity of the document in question. Its surroundings and companionship are all against it. First, it was found in the Library of the Monastery of the Most Holy Sepulchre, in Constantinople. Not exactly on Catholic ground, but on that of a relative so near of kin as to merit the title of sister rather than a daughter of the mother of harlots. A section for chapter eight will serve to show the proclivities of the unknown writer of this now famous document. It is as follows: "And let not your fasts be with the hypocrites, for they fast on the second day of the week and the fifth, but do you fast on the fourth and on the Friday." Now here is a plain command, and we are waiting to see how many of those who are

almost willing to swear by the "Teaching" will obey it. As yet we have seen no indication of any such design on the part of any one. Nobody seems to have a special interest in this portion of the precious relic. And this again proves our statement that nobody really believes that the "Teaching" carries with it any weight of authority. It simply gives the modern Athenians something new to talk about, and a new chance to exercise their wits in finding excuses for not obeying the commandment of the Lord. It would be impossible to convince the religious world that they ought to fast on Wednesdays and Fridays; if such a thing were attempted, they would immediately ask for Scripture proof. And yet there is more reason for fasting regularly on those days, or even for keeping them holy, than there is for keeping Sunday. If we wish, we could show that the seventh day was regarded as the Sabbath by the one who wrote the "Teaching," but it is not worth the while; for even it would not make a seventh-day keepers one whit more confident in their position. We do not depend upon the words of a man, but upon those of God himself, and his Son Jesus Christ.*SITI October 16, 1884, page 617.6*

Nor does the supposed fact that the so-called "Teaching of the Apostles" is a product of the second century, add much to its value. The mystery of iniquity had begun its work of opposition to God, even while Paul was living (see *2 Thessalonians 2:3-7*); and Peter warned the brethren that there should be false teachers among them, who privily would bring in damnable heresies. *2 Peter 2:1*. History bears record to the fulfillment of this prophecy. Mosheim, the learned church historian, after speaking of the mystical interpretations of the Bible, which prevailed quite largely even in the second century, says:-*SITI October 16, 1884, page 617.7*

"To this great error of the Christians may be added another, not indeed of equal extent, but a pernicious one, and productive of many evils. The Platonists and Pythagoreans deemed it not only lawful but commendable to deceive and to lie, for the sake of truth in piety. [!!] The Jews living in Egypt learned from them this sentiment, as appears from many proofs. And from both, this vice early spread to Christians. Of this no one will doubt who calls to mind the numerous *forgeries of books* under the names of eminent men, the Sibylline verses, and other similar trash, a large mass of

which appeared in this and the following centuries. I do not say that the Orthodox Christians support all the books of this character; on the contrary, it is probable that the greater part of them originated from the founders of the Gnostic sects. Yet that the Christians who were free from heterodox views were not wholly free from this fault, is too clear to be denied.”-*“Ecclesiastical History,” Book I, Century II., Part II., chap. III., section 15.**SITI October 16, 1884, page 617.8*

Thus it appears that they who place their confidence in a certain book, simply because it was written early in the Christian era, are depending upon something that is even worse than a blind guide. For even though the book contains nothing positively false, how much spiritual instruction can we expect to gain from the writings of one who will lie for the sake of “truth in piety”? This practice grew more common in the latter centuries, and finally culminated in the establishment of the papacy, with all its abominable practices. Some of these forged documents contained the most errant nonsense, and well deserved the title which Dr. Mosheim has given to them, “trash.” Others were only slightly tinged with error.*SITI October 16, 1884, page 618.1*

The reason for these forgeries is easily seen. Obscure persons, in order to secure recognition for their productions, would credit them to some well-known and highly-esteemed person. Many of these documents, as has been said, contained nothing seriously wrong. The weak productions, which, if it had not been for the famous names appended to them, would have sunk into oblivion centuries ago. The “Teaching of the Apostles” is one of these. It is for the most part a poor paraphrase of Scripture precepts, with some human additions, modeled as nearly as possible after the style the Scriptures. The writer was no doubt an inoffensive sort of person, with no original ideas except a few vagaries, and whose worst fault consisted in labeling his platitudes the “Teaching of the Apostles.” There have been far abler exponents of the apostles’ doctrine and practice, who were a great deal more modest than he. Whether this little pamphlet was accepted as genuine at the time it was written, we have no means of knowing; it is not probable that it was by any; yet without doubt there were people then as well as now who were more willing to take their religion at second-hand than to search for themselves at the fountain head.*SITI October 16, 1884, page 618.2*

Next week we shall consider farther early writings in general, and the right of the “Teaching” to claim respectability, in view of the company in which was found. E. J. W.*SITI October 16, 1884, page 618.3*

October 23, 1884

“The Sabbath-School” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—NOV. 9

1. Of what substance did God create man? Quote proof, and give reference. *SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.1*
2. What was given him to make him live? *SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.2*
3. In what part of man is this breath of life located? *SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.3*
4. When man's breath is taken away, what takes place? *Job 34:14, 15. SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.4*
5. What then becomes of the breath which causes him to live? *Ecclesiastes 12:7. SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.5*
6. Is man the only creature that has this breath or spirit of life? *Genesis 7:14, 15. SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.6*
7. In what part of the beast is this breath placed? *Genesis 7:21 22. SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.7*
8. When God takes away their breath, what becomes of them? *Psalms 104:29. SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.8*
9. Is the breath of the man any different from that of the beast? *Ecclesiastes 3:19. SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.9*
10. Of what are both beast and man composed? *Verse 20. SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.10*
11. In what do both classes alike return at death? *SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.11*

12. Is there any difference between a wise man and the fool in the matter of death? *Psalm 49:10.SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.12*

13. Does David agree with Solomon in saying that the death of man is the same as that of beasts? *Verse 14.SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.13*

14. If this is the case, what hope can a man have in life? *Isaiah 26:19; Job 19:25-27.SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.14*

15. If there were to be no resurrection, would man be justified in living as the beast does? *1 Corinthians 15:32.SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.15*

16. Then in what does man have the pre-eminence above the beast?*SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.16*

17. Where do we find a graphic illustration of the resurrection? *Ezekiel 37:1-12.SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.17*

18. What did the prophet see? *Verse 1.SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.18*

19. Were the bones living? *Verses 2, 3.SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.19*

20. By what means did the Lord say he would cause them to live? *Verses 5, 6.SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.20*

21. When the prophet prophesied, what took place? *Verses 7, 8.SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.21*

22. When the bones, sinews, flesh, and skin were all in their proper place, what was still lacking? *Verse 8.SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.22*

23. What was the prophet next directed to say? *Verse 9.SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.23*

24. How were the bodies made to live? *Verse 10.SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.24*

25. Then for what purpose does God receive a man's breath or spirit of life when he dies?*SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.25*

In *Genesis 2:7* we are told that "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." It does not say that a soul was put into man, whereby he might live, but that man himself *became* a dual being, composed of body and soul, and that the first was formed of the dust, but that the latter is pure spirit. Without entering into a discussion of the subject of the soul, what it is, we are warranted, by the text just quoted, in saying that whatever different elements combine to form "man," were made of the dust of the ground. When the catechisms tell us that man is composed of body, soul, and spirit, then they must also claim that all these were formed of the dust, for "man" was born of the dust. But the fact is, that which was formed of the dust was "man" before the breath or spirit of life was bestowed. He was a lifeless soul; but when the breath was given, man *became* a living soul.*SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.26*

This conclusion is verified by *Job 34:14, 15*. The patriarch, speaking of God, says: "If he set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust." After the breath is taken away, then man turns again to dust. That this breath may be called a spirit is shown by *Job 27:3, 4*, quoted in last week's lesson: "All the while my breath is in me, and the spirit of God is in my nostrils; my lips shall not speak wickedness, nor my tongue utter deceit." Here the spirit (called the spirit of God, because it came from God) is said to be in the nostrils, and that, it will be remembered, is where God placed the breath of life, which is the same thing.*SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.27*

In the light of the above texts, we can readily understand *Ecclesiastes 12:7*, where, after having spoken of death, the wise man says: "Then shall the dust return to the earth, as it was; and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." This is no more than a repetition of *Job 34:14, 15*: "If he [God] gather to himself his [man's] spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again to dust." Both texts teach simply this: that at death man

returns to his original elements; that which was born of the dust-the whole man-returns to the dust, and the spirit or breath, having come directly from God, returns to his keeping. There is no more reason for supposing that the spirit, as it returns to God, is conscious, than there is in supposing that the dust is conscious, or that the spirit was conscious before God bestowed it upon man, or that the breath, while in man's nostrils, was conscious. The dust of which man was formed was inanimate; man, after he was formed by the Creator, was inanimate, unconscious; and the spirit while yet in the hands of God was likewise without consciousness; but when the man and the spirit were brought together, conscious existence was the result. How this result was obtained is a secret known only to the Author of life. *SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.28*

This breath of life is something that man shares in common with the beasts. In the description of the flood we learn that every beast and creeping thing-"all in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died." *Genesis 7:21, 22*. It is not the possession of the breath or spirit of life that distinguishes man from the beast. In *Psalms 104:28-30* we learn that their creation is effected by God sending forth his spirit, and that, as we learned concerning man, when he takes away their breath they die, and return to their dust. More than this, we are expressly told that there is no difference between the formation of man and lower animals, nor in the elements composing them. We read: "For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no preeminence above a beast: for all is vanity. All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." *Ecclesiastes 3:19, 20*. This language is plain, and no apology is needed for it, because it is the language of inspiration. Let it be remembered that when the wise man says that a man has no pre-eminence above a beast, he is speaking of death. In that event all are alike. Here the parallel ends, for to man a resurrection is promised. In this life man has pre-eminence above the beast, because he is gifted with a moral nature, the faculty of distinguishing between right and wrong, and the power of loving the right because it is right. This the beast does not have. To all men a resurrection is promised, but not to beasts. If, however, it shall then appear that a part of mankind have died as do the beast, without

regard to the future, they will die the second death, and then they will indeed be like the beasts that perish, for with that death their existence will forever end. Man's hope is in the resurrection; but he cannot have a well-grounded hope even in that, unless he seeks those things which are above.*SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.29*

Ezekiel 37:1-14 brings to view the literal resurrection of the dead. First the bones, sinews, muscles, and skin are arranged in proper order. At death these return to the earth, but now they are re-formed. There are the complete bodies; but there is no breath in them. They are just as Adam was before God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. But at the command of the Lord the breath comes into the inanimate bodies, and they stand upon their feet, an exceeding great army. Some choose to apply all this to the bringing of literal Israel from the Babylonian captivity, but such an interpretation is of their own choosing, and not by divine authority. God himself (*verse 12*) says that it is the bringing of his people out of their graves, and this takes place when the Lord comes. *1 Thessalonians 4:15-17; John 5:28, 29*. And thus we learn that when the spirit-that which causes man to live-returns to God at the death of the man, it is that he may bestow it again at the resurrection, when man shall live *again*. E. J. W.*SITI October 23, 1884, page 630.30*

“The ‘Teaching of the Apostles’” The Signs of the Times, 10, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

CHARACTER OF EARLY WRITINGS IN GENERAL

The admirers of this document have been led to put unlimited confidence in it, as a production fully equal to the New Testament, because the same manuscript in which it was bound contains the two epistles of Clement of Rome, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the epistles of Ignatius. We shall therefore devote a little attention to them to see if proximity to them materially enhances its value. But first we wish to show the general character of the writings ascribed to the early Fathers.*SITI October 23, 1884, page 632.1*

In the preceding article we quoted testimony from Mosheim, which

showed that forgery, interpolations, and the palming off of spurious writings, were common practices even in the early part of the second century. So, then, however much credit for honesty and orthodoxy we may be inclined to give to the Fathers themselves, we cannot depend with any certainty on their perverted writings. It is impossible to distinguish the genuine from the false. But this need not cause us any concern, since they were not inspired, and, consequently, their testimony is of no more authority on any subject than that of anybody else. When we want information concerning the question of morals or of Christian duty, we must go to the Holy Scriptures-the inspired word of God. That alone is a sure guide.*SITI October 23, 1884, page 632.2*

In his "Ecclesiastical History," Book I., Cent. II., Part II., chap. III sections 5 and 6, after having spoken of the works of several of the Fathers, among which he mentioned certain writings of Clement of Alexandria, Tatian, Justin Martyr, and Theophilus of Antioch, Dr. Mosheim says, "All these works are lost." He then continues:-*SITI October 23, 1884, page 632.3*

"But this loss is the less to be regretted, since it is certain that no one of these expositors could be pronounced a good interpreter. They all believed the language of Scripture to contain two meanings, the one obvious, and corresponding with the direct import of the words, the other recondite, and concealed under the words, like a nut in the shell; and neglecting the former, as being of little value, they bestowed their chief attention on the latter; that is, they were more intent on throwing obscurity over the sacred writings by the fictions of their own imaginations, than of searching out their true meaning."*SITI October 23, 1884, page 632.4*

In the next section he says: "It is therefore not strange that all sects of Christians can find in what are called 'the Fathers,' something to favor their own opinions and systems." And in section 8 of the same chapter, after having mentioned several other writers, among them Irenaeus and Tertullian, Mosheim says:-*SITI October 23, 1884, page 632.5*

"In these disputants there was something more of ingenuousness and good faith, than in those who undertook the support of truth in

the following centuries. For the convenient wiles of sophistry, and the dishonorable artifices of debate, had not yet gained admittance among Christians. Yet a man of sound judgment, who has due regard for truth, cannot extol them highly. Most of them lacked discernment, knowledge, application, good arrangement, and force. They often advance very flimsy arguments, and such as are suited rather to embarrass the mind than to convince the understanding.”*SITI October 23, 1884, page 632.6*

This is the character of the writings which contain the strongest arguments that can be found for the observance of Sunday. But we quote Mosheim once more. In the tenth section of the chapter above referred to, he states that learned men are not agreed as to the estimation in which these Fathers should be held, and says:-*SITI October 23, 1884, page 632.7*

“To us it appears that their writings contain many things excellent, well considered, and well calculated to enkindle pious emotions; and also many things unduly rigorous, and derived from the Academic and Stoic philosophy; *many things vague and indeterminate*; and *many things positively false*, and inconsistent with the precepts of Christ. If one deserves the title a bad master in morals, who has no just ideas of the proper boundaries and limitations of Christian duty, nor clear and distinct conceptions of the different virtues and vices, nor a perception of those general principles to which recurrence should be had in all discussions respecting Christian virtue, and therefore very often talks at random, and blunders and expanding the divine laws, though he may say many excellent things, and excite in us considerable emotion; then I can readily admit that in strict truth this title belongs to many of the Fathers.”*SITI October 23, 1884, page 632.8*

Much more of this sort of testimony might be cited from Mosheim, who certainly cannot be called a prejudiced witness, but this is sufficient. And writers of this class are they whom we are asked to accept as authority for Sunday-keeping, and as competent expositors of the teaching of the apostles. We beg to be excused. When we can find no better authority for the observance of the day of rest, than they are, we will be our own authority. We cannot close this article with anything more to the point, and more worthy of

general acceptance, then the following paragraph from “The Ancient Church,” by Dr. Wm. Killen, professor of the Ecclesiastical History and Pastoral Theology to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. After having noticed the erroneous and absurd expositions of the Fathers, he says:-*SITI October 23, 1884, page 632.9*

“It would seem as if the great Head of the Church permitted these early writers to commit the grossest mistakes, and to propound the most foolish theories, for the express purpose of teaching us that we are not implicitly to follow their guidance. It might have been thought that authors who flourished on the borders of apostolic times, knew more of the mind of the Spirit than others who appeared in succeeding ages; but the truths of Scripture, like the phenomena of the visible creation, are equally intelligible to all generations. If we possess spiritual discernment, the trees and flowers will display the wisdom and the goodness of God as distinctly to us as they did to our first parents; and if we have the ‘unction from the Holy One,’ we may enter into the meaning of the Scriptures as fully as did Justin Martyr or Irenaeus [and far more]. To assist us in the interpretation of the New Testament, we have at command a critical apparatus of which they were unable to avail themselves. Jehovah is jealous for the honor of his word, and he has inscribed in letters of light over the labors of its most ancient interpreters-‘CEASE YE FROM MAN.’ The ‘opening of the Scriptures,’ so as to exhibit their duty, their consistency, their purity, their wisdom, and their power, is the clearest proof that the commentator is possessed of ‘the key of knowledge.’ When tried by this task, Thomas Scott or Matthew Henry are better entitled to confidence than either Origen or Gregory Thaumaturgus. The Bible is its own safest expositor. “The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple.”-*Period II., Section I., Chapter I., last paragraphSITI October 23, 1884, page 632.10*

In our next article we shall notice the writings in whose immediate company the “Teaching” was found. E. J. W.*SITI October 23, 1884, page 632.11*

“What Constitutes a Christian?” The Signs of the Times, 10, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

A short time ago the Chinese of San Francisco had a grand celebration in honor of one of their gods. The *Chronicle* gave a full account of this heathen festival, and of the procession through the streets, which, with the idol at the head, was marked by all the gaudy display peculiar to the Chinese. The *Pacific* (Congregationalist) copies the *Chronicle*'s report, and adds the following comment:-*SITI October 23, 1884, page 632.12*

"This is still called a Christian country, and there are still some who teach their children, 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me,' and 'Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image.' What do these boys and girls think as they see the regular sacrificial smoked hog carried in procession to the joss-house, and placed before the idol?"*SITI October 23, 1884, page 632.13*

We are glad for this testimony of the *Pacific* as to what makes one a Christian. Not because it is anything new, but because it is in harmony with the Bible. "This is still called a Christian country," it says. Why? Because parents still teach their children the commandments of God. A more direct and truthful statement of the case could not have been made. Let us see how well it is sustained by the Scriptures.*SITI October 23, 1884, page 632.14*

The definition of Christian as "one who believes the doctrine of Christ," will be accepted by all. He said, "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love." *John 15:10*. That these commandments are not something peculiar to Christ, and distinct from the Father's law, we learn from *John 17:14*, where Christ says to the Father, "I have given them thy word;" and again: "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." *John 7:16*; and yet again from *John 6:38*: "For I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." From these declarations we should understand that Christ came to declare the righteousness of God's law, and to enable men to obey it. In this he set the example, and whosoever walks as he walked, *i.e.*, keeps the commandments of God, is a Christian.*SITI October 23, 1884, page 632.15*

This conclusion is verified by Christ's statement concerning the law, in the sermon on the mount. "Think not," he says, "that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." *Matthew 5:17-19*. Some affect to understand from *verse 19* that breakers of the law may gain an entrance into Heaven, but that they will occupy a low place; but that is not the meaning of the text. The true force of the verse is grasped by Dr. Clarke, who says:-*SITI October 23, 1884, page 632.16*

"He who by his mode of *acting, speaking, or explaining*, the words of God, sets the holy precept aside, or explains away its force or meaning, shall be called least-shall have *no place* in the kingdom of Christ here, nor in the kingdom of glory above. That this is the meaning of these words is evident enough from the following verse." *SITI October 23, 1884, page 633.1*

Christ, then, kept and taught the commandments and he expressly declares, what the *Pacific* implies, that none who do otherwise can be followers of him. "Why call ye the Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" *Luke 7:46*. Now read a few testimonies from the apostles. John says: "He that saith he abideth in Him, ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked." *1 John 2:6*. Peter contrasts the frailty of man with the enduring nature of the word of God, saying that all flesh shall wither as the grass, "But the word of the Lord endureth forever." "And this," he says, "is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." *1 Peter 1:25*. The gospel, then, proclaims the righteousness and stability of God's law. How could it be otherwise? The gospel brings the good news of pardon for sin. But sin is the transgression of the law, and the very act of announcing a pardon bears witness to the existence of the law; for without the law there can be no transgression, and consequently no necessity for pardon. To offer a pardon to a man after the abolition of law which condemned him, would be an insult. *SITI October 23, 1884, page 633.2*

As the gospel of Christ preaches obedience to the law, so it carries with it that assistance which makes it possible for man to keep the law. Paul says: "For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh [it could not justify a sinner], God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness [requirement, or precept] of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." *Romans 8:3, 4*. All these witnesses agree that a Christian is one who follows Christ in obeying the commandments of God, using the strength which Christ bestows. *SITI October 23, 1884, page 633.3*

One more testimony we will add. Paul, as the representative of the Christian ministry, says: "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God. For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." *2 Corinthians 5:20, 21*. What is it to be made "the righteousness of God"? If "all unrighteousness is sin" (*1 John 5:17*), then righteousness is the exact opposite of sin; but "sin is the transgression of the law," and therefore righteousness is the keeping of the law. So then *2 Corinthians 5:21* simply states that Christ's work was in order that we might be brought into perfect harmony with the law of God. *SITI October 23, 1884, page 633.4*

It is true that the *Pacific* did not mention the entire law as requisite to constitute one a Christian; it only mentioned the first and second precepts of the law. But we recall the Saviour's words, that "it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail." *Luke 16:17*. Also the words of James: "For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." *James 2:11*. The *Pacific* will, no doubt, readily admit that the keeping of these two commandments (the sixth and seventh) is as necessary to protect Christianity as is the keeping of the first and second. Very well, then we will try again: For he that said, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," and "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image," said also, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but *the seventh day is the Sabbath* of the Lord thy God; in IT thou

shalt not do any work.” Now if thou make no graven image nor worship any false god, yet if thou labor on the seventh day, thou art become a transgressors of the law. The law being a unit, incapable of being divided, we cannot see why keeping and teaching the fourth commandment is not as necessary to constitute one a perfect Christian as is the keeping of the first or second. Will the *Pacific* accept this conclusion, and act accordingly? If not, why not? E. J. W. *SITI* October 23, 1884, page 633.5

October 30, 1884

“The Sabbath-School” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—NOV. 22

1. What is the meaning of the word “immortal”? *SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.1*
2. Quote three texts which prove positively that man is not immortal. *SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.2*
3. Who alone has immortality? *SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.3*
4. May man ever become immortal? *SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.4*
5. What must he do in order to receive immortality? *SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.5*
6. Can we earn immortality, or do we receive it as a gift? Give proof. *SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.6*
7. Where must we look for immortality? *SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.7*
8. Can you prove from the Bible that eternal life will not be given to the wicked? *SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.8*
9. For what purpose did Christ come to earth? *SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.9*
10. Who alone does Christ say have everlasting life? *SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.10*
11. In what sense do we have it now? *SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.11*
12. When shall we come into possession of it? Give proof. *SITI*

October 30, 1884, page 646.12

13. In the Bible, by what figure are the dead often represented? Give instances.*SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.13*

14. In what place are they asleep?*SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.14*

15. Until what time do they sleep?*SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.15*

16. Is there any business carried on in the grave? Quote proof.*SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.16*

17. Do the dead know what their friends on earth are doing?*SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.17*

18. Do any of the dead praise the Lord?*SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.18*

19. State in Bible language just how much the dead do know.*SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.19*

20. At what point of time do men thus lose all consciousness?*SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.20*

21. From what does this breath of life come?*SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.21*

22. To whom does it return at death?*SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.22*

23. What is the difference, if any, between the breath of man and that a beast?*SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.23*

24. Of what is man composed?*SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.24*

25. To what does he return at death?*SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.25*

26. What is the difference between the death of man and that a beast?*SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.26*

27. Then what is it that makes a man's life so much more valuable than that of a beast?*SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.27*

28. Give two texts of Scripture that you have already learned, which prove that man can derive no benefit from praying to the Virgin Mary.*SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.28*

The lesson for this week being a review of the subject of immortality, it will be in place to make the notes of a general nature. From our previous study we have learned that the terms "immortal" and "immortality" do not occur in the Bible so frequently as is so commonly supposed. In hymns and sermons and essays we find such expressions as "immortal soul," "immortal spirit," "undying spirit," "death blessed soul," "the immortal part of man," etc., very frequently. In the Bible we look for them in vain. Query: If the Bible does not contain any of these expressions, by what authority do Christian teachers use them? Where are we to look for information concerning the nature of man? Shall we look to our own experience and observation? That would lead us to conclude that man is mortal, for we see death on all sides. We do not need the words of inspiration to convince us that man's life is "even a vapor, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away." Death and decay are the lot of all earthly beings. If we turn history, we find that such has ever been the case. The biographies of all men end with the statement, "And he died." Shall we go to the heathen authors? If we do we shall find them contradicting one another, one affirming that man has a principle within him that cannot be destroyed, another declaring that death ends all; and by this very diversity of opinion they proclaim their own ignorance of the subject. And yet these very heathen "philosophers" are the ones to whom Christianity is indebted for its dogma of inherit immortality.*SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.29*

It is indeed strange that professed followers of Christ should turn from the statements of "holy men of God," who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," to the conjectures of men who "when they knew God, glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened;" to those who, while professing themselves to be wise, became fools; who, because they did not like to retain God in their

knowledge, were given over “to a mind avoid of judgment.” Yet this is what is done. The words of Plato and Socrates are preferred above those of Job, Isaiah, David, Luke, Peter, and Paul. For when we turn to Holy Writ, where alone wisdom dwells, we find no record of “the immortal part of man,” but perfect unanimity in declaring that “it is appointed unto man once to die,” that there is no man that liveth that can deliver his soul from the hand of the grave, and that God only hath immortality. *SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.30*

If we look for the origin of the anti-scriptural doctrine of natural immortality, we find that it sprung from the mind of Satan, the father of lies. The archdeceiver said to the mother of the race: “Ye shall not surely die,” but “ye shall be as gods,” or, as God. The same trait that prompted the acceptance of this doctrine, has perpetuated it. Vanity, love of self, is that to which Satan has deceived the world. It was flattering to Eve’s vanity to be told that she had the principles of life within herself, so that she could maintain her own existence as well as God can. It was for this reason that heathen philosophers seized upon the idea, and is largely for this reason that the Catholic Church adopted it from them. From the Catholic Church, Protestant bodies have received it as a sacred legacy. When we realize the practical effect of the doctrine-to make one self-confident, and regardless of God as the Author of life, and of Christ, as the one through whom it is vouchsafed to man, we can understand something of the far-reaching policy of Satan. *SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.31*

There are but a few Catholic abominations for which this dogma is not responsible. Out of it grew purgatory, and the sale of indulgences, by which the pope of Rome waxed rich at the expense of the purses and the morals of the people of Europe. Without that doctrine, the worship of so-called saints, and of the Virgin Mary, would find no place in the Catholic Church. And Spiritualism, that masterpiece of deception, would make no headway but for the prevalence of the belief that departed ones are not really dead. It is a fact that so long as Protestants hold to the doctrine of inherent immortality, they have no weapon with which to successfully meet the errors of Catholicism, or the deceptions of Spiritualism. But the unlearned peasant, who relies on the Bible as God’s holy word, and who understands its simple and harmonious truths, may, with the

help of God, withstand the assaults of learned prelates or blasphemous infidels. E. J. W.*SITI October 30, 1884, page 646.32*

“The ‘Teaching of the Apostles’” The Signs of the Times, 10, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

COMPANY IN WHICH IT WAS FOUND

Last week we quoted some testimony to show the untrustworthy character of the writings ascribed to the Fathers in general; in this article we propose to examine the character of those particular writings whose reflected light add so much to the so-called “Teaching of the Apostles.” These are the two epistles of Clement of Rome, the “Epistle of Barnabas,” and the “Epistles of Ignatius.” The first in order is Clement of Rome. Of him Mosheim says:*SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.1*

“Next after the apostles, Clement, bishop of Rome, obtained very high reputation as one of the writers of this century. The accounts we have at this day of his life, actions, and death, are for the most part uncertain. There are still extant two epistles to the Corinthians, bearing his name, written in Greek; of these, it is generally supposed that the first is genuine, and that the second is falsely palmed upon the holy man by some deceiver. Yet even the first epistle seems to have been corrupted by some indiscrete person, who was sorry to see no more marks of erudition and genius in the works of so great a man.”-*Eccl. Hist. Book I., Cent. I, Part II, chap. III, section 18.SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.2*

Of one of the epistles of Clement, Neander says:*SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.3*

“This letter, although, on a whole, genuine, is, nevertheless, not free from important interpolations.”-*Rose’s Neander, p. 408.SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.4*

It will be remembered that “the two epistles of Clement” are included in the manuscript which contains the “Teaching.” M’Clintock and Strong’s Cyclopedia says of the writings of

Clement:-*SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.5*

“The only genuine document in his Epistle to the Corinthians, commonly called the first, but improperly, since the so-called second epistle is not his, and is not an epistle, but only the fragment of a homily, later, perhaps, by nearly a hundred years.” *SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.6*

We quote one more testimony concerning Clement. The “Religious Encyclopedia” of Herzog, edited by Schaff, says:-*SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.7*

“Clemens Romanus, one of the most celebrated names of Christian antiquity, but so overgrown with myths that it has become next to impossible to lay bare the historical facts which it represents, occurs in all lists of the first Roman bishops, but not always in the same place.... Of the numerous writings which bear the name of Clement, most are evidently spurious.... The first epistle is an official missive from the Roman congregation to the Corinthian, occasioned by some dissensions which had arisen in the latter. As it was written in the name of the whole congregation, *it bears no author's name*.... The second epistle is not an epistle at all, but a homily; and, as is the oldest existing sermon, it is, of course, of great interest. Where, at what time, and by whom it was written, are questions of great difficulty; and of the many hypotheses which have been offered as answers, none have proved fully satisfactory.” *SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.8*

This little item is, however, conveniently forgotten by those who wish to pile up all the “evidence” possible in favor of the genuineness and authenticity of the “Teaching.” For our part, it is impossible to see why the “Teaching” should be considered any the more reliable because it is in the same manuscript with the “two epistles of Clement,” when one of those epistles was not written by Clement, and the other, if written by him, has been grossly tampered with. *SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.9*

We now come to the so-called epistle Barnabas. It will not take as long to find out the little that is known of this writing. Mosheim says:-*SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.10*

“The epistle of Barnabas, as it is called, was, in my judgment, the production of some Jewish Christian who lived in this century [the first], or the next, who had no bad intentions, but who possessed little genius, and was infected with the fabulous opinions of the Jews. He was clearly a different man from the Barnabas, the companion of St. Paul.”-*Book I, Cent. I, Part II, chap. II, section 18.SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.11*

The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia says of this epistle:-*SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.12*

“The opinion to-day is that Barnabas was not the author. The epistle was probably written in Alexandria, at the beginning of the second century, and by a Gentile Christian.”*SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.13*

Dr. Killen, in “The Ancient Church,” says:-*SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.14*

“The tract known as the epistle of Barnabas was probably composed in A. D. 135. It is the production apparently of a convert from Judaism who took special pleasure in allegorical interpretations of Scripture.”-*P. 367.SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.15*

M’Clintock and Strong’s Cyclopedia says:-*SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.16*

“An epistle has come down to us bearing the name of Barnabas, but clearly not written by him.... The writer evidently was unacquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures, and has committed a blunder of supposing that Abraham was familiar with the Greek alphabet some centuries before it existed.”*SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.17*

And, finally, Dr. Kitto, in his “Cyclopedia of Religious Literature,” says of the writer of this tract that:-*SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.18*

“He makes unauthorized additions to various parts of the Jewish Cultus; that his views of the old economy are confused and

erroneous; and that he adopts a mode of interpretation countenanced by none of the inspired writers, and at variance with every principle of sound criticism, being to the last degree puerile and absurd. The inference is unavoidable, that Barnabas, 'the son of prophecy,' 'the man full of the Holy Spirit and of faith,' was not the author of this epistle." *SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.19*

We now turn to the epistles of Ignatius. To save space, we will quote from only two authors. Mosheim says:-*SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.20*

"A regard for truth requires it to be acknowledged that so considerable a degree of obscurity hangs over the question respecting the authenticity of not only a part, but the whole of the epistles ascribed to Ignatius, as to render it all together a case of much intricacy and doubt."-*"Historical Commentaries," Vol. I, Cent. I. Section 52. SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.21*

We have before quoted from Dr. W. D. Killen, Professor of the Ecclesiastical History and Pastoral Theology to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. In his book, "The Ancient Church," he devotes two chapters to the so-called epistles of Ignatius, considering at length the testimony for and against their genuineness. In his preface he says:-*SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.22*

"If we accredit these documents, the history of the early church is thrown into a state of hopeless confusion; and men, taught and honored by the apostles themselves, must have inculcated the most dangerous errors. But if their claims vanish when touched by the wand of truthful criticism, many clouds which have hitherto darkened the ecclesiastical horizon disappear, and the progress of corruption can be traced on scientific principles. The special attention of all interested in the Ignatian controversy is invited to the two chapters of this work in which the subject is investigated. Evidence is there produced to prove that these Ignatian letters, even as edited by the very learned and laborious Dr. Cureton, are utterly spurious, and that they should be swept away from among the genuine remains of early church literature with the besom of scorn." *SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.23*

In *chapter 3 of section 2*, first paragraph, the history of the Ignatian epistles is stated so clearly that we quote it entire. He says:-*SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.24*

“The history of the Ignatian epistles may well remind us of the story of the Sibylline Books. A female in strange attire is said to have appeared before Tarquin of Rome, offering to sell nine manuscripts which she had in her possession; but the king, discouraged by the price, declined the application. The woman withdrew, destroyed the one-third of her literary treasures, and, returning again into the royal presence, demanded the same price for what were left. The monarch once more refused her terms; and the mysterious visitor retired again, and burnt up the one-half of her remaining store. Her extraordinary conduct excited much astonishment, and, on consulting with his augurs, Tarquin was informed that the documents which she had at her disposal were most valuable, and that he should by all means endeavor to secure such a price. The king now willingly paid for the three books not yet committed to the flames, the full price originally demanded for all the manuscript. The Ignatian epistles have experienced something like the fate of those Sibylline oracles. In the sixteenth century, fifteen letters were brought out from beneath the mantle of a hoary antiquity, and offered to the world as the productions of the pastor of Antioch. Scholars refused receive them on the terms required, and forthwith eight of them were admitted to be forgeries. In the seventeenth century, the seven remaining letters, in a somewhat altered report, again came forth from obscurity, and claimed to be the works of Ignatius. Again, discerning critics refused to acknowledge their pretensions; but curiosity was aroused by this second apparition, and many expressed an earnest desire to obtain a sight of the real epistles. Greece, Syria Palestine, and Egypt were ransacked in search of them, and at length three letters are found. The discovery creates general congratulation; it is confessed that four of the epistles, so lately asserted to be genuine, are apocryphal; and it is boldly said that the three now forthcoming are above challenge. But truth still refuses to be compromised, and still disowns these claimants for her approbation. The internal evidence of these three epistles abundantly attest that, like the last three books of the Sibl. they are only the last shifts of a grave imposture.”*SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.25*

Comment on the testimony here quoted must be reserved for another article. These quotations should be borne in mind by the reader. They are valuable, and should be preserved by all who are interested in the Sabbath controversy, and who have not access to the original sources of information. E. J. W. *SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.26*

“The Mission of Christ” The Signs of the Times, 10, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” *John 3:16*. In previous numbers of the SIGNS, we considered briefly the subject of eternal life—that which those have who believe in Christ. We learn that eternal life is the gift of God through Jesus Christ (*Romans 6:23*), and that therefore none can ever possess it unless they have the Son. *John 3:36*. The question now arises, “What shall those have who do not believe in Christ?” In this article, and succeeding ones, we shall seek a Bible answer to this question. An understanding of this subject is necessary, not merely that we may be driven to Christ through fear of the consequences of unbelief, but that we may have a proper appreciation of the love of God. We cannot praise God, and his love to us as manifested in Christ, as we ought, unless we understand, as far as our finite minds are capable of understanding, that from which his love rescues us. *SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.27*

In the first place, we notice that their condition is different from that of believers in Christ. This has already been shown. Christ said to the unbelieving Jews, “Ye will not come to me, that ye might have life.” *John 5:40*. The obvious meaning is that they had not life, and could not have it without coming to him, and accepting him as their Saviour. From *John 3:17* some would argue that all mankind will be saved, because Christ said “For God sent not this Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might have life.” Such a conclusion shows the folly of basing a theory on a single text, regardless of other texts or the context. The eighteenth verse explains the seventeenth. “He that believeth on him is not condemned: but he that believeth not is *condemned already*,

because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God.” Now we know why God did not send his Son into the world to condemn the world. That would have been an unnecessary proceeding. The world was condemned already. His mission was to save as many as possible from a lost world. “God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” *Romans 5:8*. The tenth verse of this chapter shows that being sinners is equivalent to being enemies; and that is why the world was condemned, because all have sinned.*SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.28*

God sent his Son “that the world through him might be saved;” there was opportunity for all the world to be saved if they would, but they must comply with the condition,-believe on Christ. And now what is to become of those who do not accept this condition? The verse quoted at the beginning of this article tells us: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” From this we learn that if God had not sent his Son, the whole world would have perished; and since the condition of salvation is belief in Christ, it necessarily follows that those who do not believe in him will perish; they will accept nothing from Christ, and therefore they receive the same doom that they would if he had not come.*SITI October 30, 1884, page 649.29*

In the passage under consideration (*John 3:16-18*), there are two classes brought to view, believers and unbelievers. The first class receive the reward of eternal life, the second class are left to perish. Now since these two classes are directly opposite in character, it must follow that to perish is the exact opposite of eternal life. The opposite of life is death, and the opposite of eternal life is eternal death. That death is what unbelievers receive, we learn from *Romans 6:23*: “The wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.”*SITI October 30, 1884, page 650.1*

In *Romans 5:12* we learn how the whole world came to be in this state of condemnation, on account of which they would all perish if it were not for Christ. Paul says: ‘Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon

all men, for that all have sinned;" etc. Adam was the one man by whom sin entered into the world. The stream, unassisted, cannot rise higher than the fountain, and therefore Adam's posterity are necessarily born into a state of sin. When Adam sinned, God looked down the ages and saw a whole human race in a state of rebellion, and, consequently, of condemnation; and then it was that his great love was manifested, in giving his only begotten Son to die for a rebellious world. Since the sentence pronounced upon Adam extended to the whole human race, we will turn and examine it. *SITI October 30, 1884, page 650.2*

In *Genesis 2:15-17* we learn that God placed Adam in Eden to dress it and to keep it, giving him permission to eat freely of the fruit of every tree, with one exception. Concerning that the Lord said: "But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." There has been much bewildering comment on this verse, the conclusion usually being that the death here threatened was threefold, viz., "death spiritual, death temporal, and death eternal." But as in the giving of the law, so also in pronouncing the penalty for its violation, the words must be understood in "their usual and most known signification." When the words of a law or of a penalty are such as are in common use, no one is justified in placing any construction upon them. Now the term "die" in the text is unqualified, and it must therefore mean simple death. It cannot mean *spiritual* death for the following reasons: 1. Nothing is said about any such kind of death. 2. According to the commonly accepted meaning of spiritual death-a state of sin-the act of eating the forbidden fruit would have been spiritual death; and consequently the penalty pronounced upon Adam for a certain act would have been the condition of the act prohibited! But the penalty was not the act itself, but something that should follow that act. Either could mean *temporal* death, i.e., death for a time; for that would be equivalent to a pardon before the sin was committed, which would be absurd. As before stated, the penalty was simply *death*. *SITI October 30, 1884, page 650.3*

Right here we are met with an objection. Says the objector: "You cannot take the words of the penalty in their exact literal signification, because they read thus: '*In the day* that thou eatest

thereof thou shalt surely die,' and the record says that Adam lived nine hundred years." Still we say that the penalty means just what it says. If it does not, then Adam had no means of knowing what would be the penalty if he should sin. The objection arises from the erroneous supposition that the sentence has been carried into effect. Those who make it seem to forget the words of Christ, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." If God had not so loved the world, the sentence would have been executed, Adam would have died that very day, and we, his posterity, would never have existed. It was not Adam all alone whom God loved, but the whole race whom he had created in him. On account of this great love, the execution of the sentence was stayed, and man was granted another trial. The plan of salvation was devised, and Christ agreed to take the sins of the world upon himself, and rescue man from his lost condition. Bear in mind the fact that God did not revoke the penalty; he merely stayed its execution, in order to give men a chance to accept the conditions of pardon. If none of Adam's race should accept these conditions then they would all suffer the penalty threatened to him; if a few accept the conditions, then they alone escape the threat of doom. And so when we read that Christ was given that whosoever believeth in him should *not perish*, we understand that the original penalty announced to Adam was that he should perish. "To perish" signifies, "to be destroyed; to go to destruction; to come to nothing; to be blotted from existence." That this will be the doom of all who disregard the love and mercy of God in Christ Jesus, is fully borne out by the Scriptures, as we shall see. *SITI October 30, 1884, page 650.4*

It may not be out of place to briefly consider the marginal reading of *Genesis 2:17*: "Dying thou shalt die." By some this is supposed to afford an answer to the objection that Adam did not immediately die and that therefore the words of the penalty cannot be taken literally. From this marginal reading they gather that the penalty threatened was that the seeds of death, as it is expressed, would be sown in Adam as soon as he sinned, or, in other words, that he would become mortal, and would eventually die. But this does not help the matter at all; for if we substitute "thou shall die," for, "thou shalt surely die," we are still shut up to the fact that this was to occur "*in*

the day that thou eatest thereof.” The truth is that the marginal reading does not express to us the meaning of the original so correctly as to the words of the text, “Thou shalt *surely* die.” It is a construction that often occurs in the original, when emphasis is required. It is used in *Genesis 2:16*: “Of every tree of the garden thou mayest free eat.” The marginal reading is, “eating thou shalt eat.” This does not mean that he should begin to eat and continue to eat until the act of eating should be consummated, but was an emphatic permission to Adam to eat. *SITI October 30, 1884, page 650.5*

The same construction is used in *Exodus 3:7*, where the Lord says, “I have surely seen the affliction of my people.” Had our translators done as they did in *Genesis 2:16, 17*, they would have placed in the margin, “Seeing I have seen.” Then, according to the interpretation given to the marginal reading of *Genesis 2:17*, it would mean that God began to see, and continue to see, until finally he saw. This would make nonsense of the text, yet it would be as legitimate an interpretation as the other. The expression is simply an emphatic statement that God had seen the affliction of his people; and Stephen, in his discourse (*Acts 7:34*), marks this emphasis by the repetition of the statement: “I have seen, I have seen.” So the statement in *Genesis 2:17* did not mean that man should begin to die and continue to die until he should finally be dead, but it was an explicit an emphatic declaration that death should immediately follow his sin. If we should translate this passages as Stephen did the similar construction in *Exodus 3:7*, it would read: “In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt die thou shalt die.” This would well express the meaning. A parallel to this emphatic declaration of the death penalty is sometimes heard in human courts. *SITI October 30, 1884, page 650.6*

“Thou shalt *surely* die.” This penalty was unequivocal and unconditional. But for the merciful forbearance of God, and his love as manifested in the promised sacrifice of Christ, the human race would have been blotted from existence, in Adam. *SITI October 30, 1884, page 650.7*

With have now found how man incurred the wrath of God; and in succeeding articles we shall learn more fully how that wrath will be

manifested to all who do not flee to the refuge offered. The consideration of the words spoken to Adam after he had sinned: "Dust thou art, and not the dust shalt thou return," must be deferred until we have finished this subject now before us. E. J. W.*SITI*
October 30, 1884, page 650.8

November 6, 1884

“The Sabbath-School” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—NOV. 29

1. What do the afflictions of this life work for us? *2 Corinthians 4:17.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.1*
2. Under what means do we behold unseen things? *Hebrews 11:1.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.2*
3. By what means do we behold unseen things? *Hebrews 11:1.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.3*
4. While looking (by faith) at unseen things, of what are we assured? *2 Corinthians 5:1.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.4*
5. What is meant by “our earthly house of this tabernacle” being dissolved? Compare *2 Peter 1:13, 14* with *John 21:18, 19.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.5*
6. What does Paul say that we earnestly desire while in this earthly tabernacle? *2 Corinthians 5:2.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.6*
7. Why do we desire to be “clothed upon”? *2 Corinthians 5:4.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.7*
8. Then to what is being “clothed upon with our house which is from heaven” equivalent?*SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.8*
9. What do these two “houses” represent? *1 Corinthians 15:44.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.9*
10. Which of these is first? *1 Corinthians 15:46.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.10*
11. When is the spiritual body bestowed? *1 Corinthians 15:42-44.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.11*

12. Whence does this spiritual body come? *1 Corinthians 15:49.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.12*

13. When is it that corruption puts on incorruption, and mortality puts on immortality? *1 Corinthians 15:42, 51-53.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.13*

14. Then when is it that mortality shall be “swallowed up of life”? *SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.14*

15. And to what is this equivalent? *2 Corinthians 5:4.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.15*

16. Who hath wrought us for this thing? *Verse 15.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.16*

17. What is it for which God hath wrought us? *SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.17*

18. As a pledge of immortality, what does he now give to us? *Verse 5.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.18*

19. If when this earthly house is dissolved, and we are “clothed up” with our heavenly house, mortality is swallowed up of life, what opposite conditions do the two houses represent? *SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.19*

20. Then in what condition are we while in this earthly body? *SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.20*

21. And while “at home in the body,” from whom are we absent? *Verse 6.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.21*

22. When is it that we shall be with the Lord? *1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.22*

23. And what do we “put on” at that time? *1 Corinthians 15:21-54; 2 Corinthians 5:2-4.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.23*

24. Since that is the dissolving of this present body, and we are not “clothed upon” with our spiritual body till the resurrection, in what condition are we between death and the resurrection? *2 Corinthians*

5:4.*SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.24*

25. But is that a desirable state?*SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.25*

26. What do we desire rather than this? *2 Corinthians 5:8.SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.26*

27. Quote the three texts to prove that we can be “present with the Lord” only at his second coming.*SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.27*

In the portion of Scripture covered by this lesson the apostle sets before us the grounds for hope. The matter what we may be called upon to suffer, we are to be of good courage, and trust in the Lord; for this is what is meant by *2 Corinthians 4:16*: “But though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day-by-day.” In the next verse he tells us why he is thus hopeful: “For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.” Surely if we believe this, we could, with the apostle, “glory in tribulation.”*SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.28*

It is not, however, for every one, nor under all circumstances, that afflictions accomplish this result. It is not to all that afflictions seem light. Each person is inclined to feel that his own trials are the most severe of any; but certainly there are none that have to endure more than Paul did. Now what was the means by which he lightened them? “For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal.” And thus it is that everybody can make their own trials light or heavy, just as they please. If they choose to look only at the present time, and think of their trials, they will appear enormous; but if they looked at eternal things-the world to come, and its joys-earthly sorrows will be entirely lost sight of. Who would not endure a moment of pain to secure a year’s pleasure? If during an entire year we should suffer pain but a single second, would that instant of pain be remembered? Certainly not; it would not attract our attention. Well,

a second of time is infinitely greater in comparison with a year, than a life-time is in comparison with the eternity. So, then, if our entire life were filled with pain, it would not be remembered in eternity. Now in order to get the benefit of this comparison *now*, and make our present afflictions seem light, we have only to transport ourselves, by faith, to the eternal world, looking so steadfastly at it that what it has to offer appears real to us. Christians are to live not alone in the present, but in the future—"for we walk by faith, not by sight." *SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.29*

But what is that unseen thing at which we look, that affords this hope? The first verse of *chapter 5* gives the answer: "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." This verse gives the answer in full; the remaining verses are devoted to enlarging upon and explaining this point. The question to be solved, then, is, What are these two houses? and when are they occupied? *SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.30*

There can be no question but that by the dissolution, of this tabernacle the apostle refers to death. Peter uses the same expression in referring to his decease. *2 Peter 1:13-15*. The fourth verse, being partially a repetition of *verse 2*, affords data for determining when the second house is bestowed. "For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." Thus we see that when we are clothed upon with our heavenly house, immortality is bestowed, or, still better, that the being "clothed upon with our house which is from heaven" is the same as the putting on of immortality. We have already learned (*1 Corinthians 15:51-54*) that immortality is given only when the Lord comes; so we conclude that this heavenly house is not received at death. This will appear still more plainly hereafter. *SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.31*

By referring to the 15th of 1 Corinthians, we find still more about these two "houses." In the forty-fourth verse we learn that there are two bodies, a natural body and the spiritual body. These bodies do not exist at the same time, but the first is the natural body, "and afterward that which is spiritual." *Verse 46. Verse 49* tells us that

this spiritual body is heavenly, thus more fully identifying it with “our house which is from heaven.” And now from *verses 42-44* we learn that this spiritual, heavenly body is given at the resurrection: “So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption. It is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power; it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body.” Thus we find that the two houses are the natural and the spiritual body; that the spiritual body is given at the resurrection, which is at the coming of the Lord; and that this receiving of the spiritual body, or “putting on immortality,” is the same as mortality being ‘swallowed up of life.’ *SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.32*

But what about the state of death? What house do we occupy then? None at all. Our condition at that time is represented by the term “unclothed.” While we are in this house-this mortal body-we groan, “earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven.” In *Romans 8:23* Paul says that that for which we groan is “The redemption of our body,” thus proving what we have already learned, that the heavenly house is the putting on of mortality. “If so be dead been clothed we shall not be found naked.” *2 Corinthians 5:3*. Now if this earthly house is dissolved at death-which none will deny-and the heavenly house is given only at the resurrection, it must be that there is a time of being unclothed. But this was not what Paul desired; it is not for which we groan. Death is not given as the object of desire. We groan with the burden of mortality, not that we desire death to rid us of the cares of this life, but desiring that mortality shall be swallowed up of life. Because we do not desire to be thus unclothed, however, is no sign that that may not be our lot. But “we shall not all sleep;” some will be living when the Lord comes, and they will change mortality for immortality “in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye.” *SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.33*

Mortality and immortality are then the two houses-the one earthly, and temporal; the other heavenly, and eternal. Now while we are in the first state we are absent from the Lord; for it is only when Christ comes, and immortality is bestowed, that we shall be “forever with the Lord.” And since this is the case, we are not only willing to be absent from this mortal state, and be present with the Lord, but that

is the thing for which we groan. Our confidence rests in the fact that God has created us for this self same thing; he designs that we shall have immortality, and to assure us that it will be given, he has given unto us the earnest of his Spirit. So long as we have that, we are sure of our future, immortal inheritance. And our faith in God's promise brings that inheritance so near, and makes it so real, that, in spite of present tribulation, we may be always "rejoicing in hope." E. J. W. *SITI November 6, 1884, page 662.34*

"Everlasting Fire" The Signs of the Times, 10, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

Last week we considered the condition of the world without Christ, the state from which Christ saves those who believe in him, and which unbelievers are to receive. It was bound to be *perdition*-the exact opposite of life eternal. In our further investigation of this subject, in order that doubts may not embarrass the mind of any, we will first consider those texts that are supposed to teach just the opposite of what we have found to be the case. And first, we will say that it is not a subject on which philosophy or mere human reason can throw light. We can know nothing about it, except what we learn from the Bible. It is not for man to say what God will or will not do. Believing that the Judge of all the earth will do right, we must prepare our minds to accept what his word says concerning the fate of those who rebel against his Government. If we should find that they are to be kept alive through eternity, suffering infinite torture, we are bound to accept that view, even though it is repugnant to our ideas of justice. And so, also, if we find, as we have already, that they are to perish, *i.e.*, be blotted from existence, then we must accept that view, however contrary it may be to our previous instruction. *SITI November 6, 1884, page 664.1*

We have said that there are, and will be at the end of the world, but two classes-believers and nonbelievers, or righteous and wicked. In the twenty-fifth of Matthew these two classes are brought to view. The King is represented as separating the two classes, setting the righteous on his right hand and the wicked on his left. "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of

the world.” *Verse 34*. This disposes of the righteous; they then receive the reward of eternal life. The time will then have come for the saints to “take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever.” *Daniel 7:18*. But what of the wicked? “Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.” *Matthew 25:41*. *SITI November 6, 1884, page 664.2*

Does the fact that the wicked are to go into “everlasting” fire, prove that they will live and be tormented to all eternity? We will not presume to decide without an examination of the Scriptures. Let the Bible be its own interpreter. In the seventh of Jude we read that “Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of *eternal* fire.” The reference will be understood by all. On account of the wickedness of the cities of the plain, God rained down fire from heaven upon them, and their fate, “suffering the vengeance of the eternal fire,” is given as an example and warning to other evil-doers. *SITI November 6, 1884, page 664.3*

Now must we understand, because those cities suffered the vengeance of “eternal fire,” that they are therefore now in existence, and will be eternal? Turn to *2 Peter 2:6*, and read: “And turning the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes condemned them with an overthrow, making them an ensample unto those that after should live ungodly.” What was the result of that eternal fire? The cities upon which it fell were turned to ashes. And Jeremiah shows that, instead of its requiring an eternity for eternal fire to accomplish its work, it takes but a short time. He says: “For the punishment of the iniquity of the daughter of my people is greater than the punishment of the sin of Sodom, that was overthrown as in a moment, and no hands stayed on her.” *Lamentations 4:6*. Now if the cities were “overthrown,” and turned to ashes, then the fire must have long ago ceased to burn. And this is the case, for the waters of the Dead Sea now roll where those cities once stood. The “eternal fire” in that case did not burn to all eternity. If that was so in one instance, it may be in another. *SITI November 6, 1884, page 664.4*

We have seen (*Matthew 25:41*) that fire is to be the means by

which the wicked are punished. What will be the result of this fire? Read *Malachi 4:1, 3*, and we shall see: “For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch.” “And ye shall tread down the wicked; for *they shall be ashes* under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts.” So we see that this “eternal fire,” into which the wicked are to go, like that which fell upon the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, will turn into ashes. That seems reasonable enough. Fire always turns to ashes that which is thrown into it, if that thing be combustible; and in this case we are told that the wicked “shall be stubble.” Why should they not be ashes when the fire has done its work? *SITI November 6, 1884, page 664.5*

On *Jude 7*, Dr. Barnes has the following comment:-*SITI November 6, 1884, page 664.6*

“The phrase ‘eternal fire’ is one that is often used to denote future punishment-as expressing the severity of the intensity of the suffering. As here used, it cannot mean that the fires which consumed Sodom and Gomorrah were literally eternal, or were kept always burning, for that was not true. The expression seems to denote, in this connection, two things: (1) That the destruction of the cities of the plain, with their inhabitants, was as entire and perpetual as *if* the fires had been always burning-the consumption was absolute and enduring-the sinners were wholly cut off, and the cities forever rendered desolate; and (2) That in its nature and duration this was a striking emblem of the destruction which will come upon the ungodly.” *SITI November 6, 1884, page 664.7*

But does the Bible also say that the fire into which the wicked are to be cast shall not be quenched? It certainly does; let us read: “And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched. Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” *Mark 9:43, 44*; also *verses 45-48*. We would not in the least evade the full force of this text; we believe in it, and yet we still hold that the wicked are to become ashes, and cease to be. Let us see if we cannot also find an instance of unquenchable fire that

has already existed and ceased to be. In the seventeenth chapter of Jeremiah, the Lord, by his prophets, warned his people against the sin of Sabbath-breaking. He told them that if they would keep the Sabbath according to his commandment, their city, Jerusalem, should stand for ever. "But," said he, "if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath day, and not to bear a burden, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and *it shall not be quenched.*" *Jeremiah 17:27.* But the Jews did not heed this warning; they continued to violate the Sabbath, and the Lord brought upon them that which he had threatened. Read what is said of it:-*SITI November 6, 1884, page 664.8*

"And the Lord God of their fathers sent to them by his messengers, rising up betimes, and sending; because he had compassion on his people, and on his dwelling-place; but they mocked the messengers of God, and despised his words, and misused his prophets, until the wrath of the Lord arose against his people, till there was no remedy. Therefore he brought upon them the king of the Chaldees, who slew their young men with the sword in the house of their sanctuary; and they burnt the house of God, and brake down the wall of Jerusalem, and burnt all the palaces thereof with fire, and destroyed all the goodly vessels thereof.... To fulfil the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah." *2 Chronicles 36:15-21. SITI November 6, 1884, page 664.9*

Here we see that as the result of that fire that was not to be quenched, the palaces were *burned*, and the vessels were *destroyed*. Is the fire burning in yet? Certainly not. Are the palaces and walls still in existence? No; the fire made an end of them. But suppose the fire that was kindled in the gates of Jerusalem had been quenched; what would have been the result? Why, the walls and palaces would not have been *devoured*, as Jeremiah had said they should.*SITI November 6, 1884, page 664.10*

Take a common occurrence. A fire breaks out in a city. The wind fans the flames so that every effort to extinguish them is in vain. The next day the papers say that certain blocks of buildings were burned to ashes. Why was it? Because the fire *could not be*

quenched. If it could have been, the buildings would have been preserved. But does the fire still continue to burn? No; it went out as soon as the buildings were consumed. There was nothing then for it to feed upon, and it died. *SITI November 6, 1884, page 664.11*

Now what did we read in Malachi that the fate of the wicked shall be? “They shall *be ashes* under the soles of your feet.” But this result would not be accomplished if the fire into which they are to be cast should be quenched. The fact that the fire shall not be quenched is the fullest proof necessary that they will be utterly consumed. Mark the strong language used by John the Baptist: “Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.” *Matthew 3:12*. Here, as in many other places, the wicked are likened to chaff; now if they are to assist in the flames of punishment to all eternity, this would be an inappropriate figure, for chaff does not long withstand the fire. And the fact that they who are represented by the chaff will not be proof against the destructive action of the fire, is indicated by the statement that he will “burn up” the chaff. *SITI November 6, 1884, page 664.12*

Right here we may notice a passage in Isaiah. “The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites. Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? who among us shall dwell with everlasting burnings?” *Isaiah 33:14*. This is a very pertinent question. Shall we conclude from that that the prophet teaches that the wicked will dwell in the fire to all eternity? That would be a hasty, shortsighted conclusion. The very next verse answers the question: “He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly; he that despiseth the gain of oppressions, that shaketh his hands from holding of bribes, that stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood, and shutteth his eyes from seeing evil.” Such, and such alone, can dwell with the devouring fire, and with everlasting burnings. While the “devouring fire” seizes upon the chaff, and *burns it up*, the righteous ones, gathered into the garner of the Lord, shall dwell in safety. Well may the sinners in Zion be afraid, for the day is coming that “shall *burn them up*, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch.” E. J. W. *SITI November 6, 1884, page 664.13*

E. J. Waggoner

The reader must bear in mind the reason why these articles are written. It is not because we attach any importance whatever to the document called the “Teaching of the Apostles,” but because some people are lauding it to the skies, and claiming that it would completely overturn all seventh-day observance. Our object was to show just how much weight it does have, so that none can have the “Teaching” as an excuse for Sunday keeping. In our investigation we have found, (1) That when correctly translated, the document does not mention the “Lord’s day;” (2) That it is not claimed by its most zealous defender that the “Teaching” was written by any of the apostles; (3) That no one knows when it was written, but they *suppose* that it was in the first, the second, or the third century; (4) That no one pretends to know who wrote it; (5) That the fact that it was written early in the Christian era adds nothing to its value, because writers on church history agree that it was a common thing to forge the names of imminent men, and that to deceive and lie in a good cause was thought to be commendable, even by those calling themselves Christians; and that even when we concede honesty of purpose to them, we cannot depend on what they say, because they were in every way unfitted to be expositors of Bible doctrine. *SITI November 6, 1884, page 665.1*

Still further, we found that the immediate company in which it was found does not recommend it, because the so-called “Epistle Barnabas” is universally conceded to be a forged document, besides being full of blunders, and puerile and absurd to the last degree. Concerning the *two* “Epistles of Clement,” we found that one is not an epistle at all, and is not claimed by scholars to be the production of Clement, and that the other *bears no author’s name*, so that nobody knows who wrote it, and, more than all, is admitted by all to have been the object of as much interpolation. And as for the “Epistles of Ignatius,” they are declared by higher authority to be base forgeries, “the last shifts of a grave imposture,” “utterly spurious,” and said only to be “swept away from among the genuine remains of early church literature with the bosom of scorn.” Such is the company in which this document that is to upset all the

calculations of Sabbath-keepers was found.*SITI November 6, 1884, page 665.2*

And now comes the venerable Bishop Bryennios himself, the one to whom the world is indebted (?) for the discovery of this wonderful production, and says that of the sixteen chapters that compose the "Teaching," the "last ten chapters are entirely distinct, and have no authority whatever, except so far as the writer happens to be correct in his injunction." And the *Independent* of October 16th, the one from which the last quotation is taken, commenting upon it, says: "European and American scholars have not claimed that *any* part of the 'Teaching' is authoritative; the first six chapters no more so than the last ten. They only insist that a whole document has value and significance as a reflection of the teachings and usages of the sub-apostolic age."*SITI November 6, 1884, page 665.3*

Surely we need quote no more testimony, the learned Bishop grants that the last portion of the "Teaching" has no authority, "except so far as the writer happens to be correct in his injunction." That is a great concession. Now we can answer for seventh-day keepers that they are not disposed to regard any writings whatever as having authority, except so far as the writer is correct; the standard of correctness must invariably be the Bible; and when any writer makes a statement that agrees with that standard, we accept it, not because certain writers said so, but because it does agree with the standard.*SITI November 6, 1884, page 665.4*

The *Independent's* statement that the whole of the "Teaching" has value only "as a reflection of the teachings and usages of the sub-apostolic age," is a confession that the document is simply one of the forgeries so common in the early centuries. It purports to be the "teaching of the apostles," when it is nothing of the kind. This proves the truth of what we said in the second article, that nobody really believes that the "Teaching" carries with it in the weight of authority. Then why did the *Advance* say that it would tend strongly "to make keepers of the seventh day change their observance to the first day, and keepers of the first day are confident of their position than heretofore"? There can be but one answer: Advocates of first-day observance have no Scripture authority for their claims, have fallen into the habit of accepting anything which seems to

support them, even though they know their witnesses to be false.*SITI November 6, 1884, page 665.5*

That this conclusion is not ill advised, appears from an examination of the quotations in our last article, concerning the so-called epistles of Clement, Barnabas, and Ignatius. Those quotations were made for a twofold purpose. First, to show the writings from whose company the "Teaching" derived so much of its honor, and second, that our readers might know the foundation upon which the Sunday institution is built. For, be it known, the same writings.-p those attributed to Clement, Barnabas, and Ignatius,-are constantly quoted in behalf of Sunday observance. The statements found in them, together with a few from other "Fathers," equally untrustworthy, are the strongest proofs brought to bear in favor of Sunday-keeping. Men who write "D. D." after their names, who have graduated at theological seminaries, where church history is a most prominent branch of study, and used textbooks in that study were those from which we have made our quotations, will quote the words of these "Fathers," with as much assurance as though they were inspired. We will not question the honesty of such men, but we think that the following words are fulfilled in them:-*SITI November 6, 1884, page 665.6*

"Wherefore the Lord said, Forasmuch as this people draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men; therefore, behold, I will proceed to do a marvellous work among this people, even a marvellous work and a wonder: for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid." *Isaiah 29:13, 14.SITI November 6, 1884, page 665.7*

The reader will have little difficulty in estimating at its true value of the evidence that has formed the basis for Sunday observance, when he reads the statement of the *Advance*, that the "Teaching" will tend to "make first-day keepers more confident of their position than heretofore." Vain confidence! As though any number of untruths could be made to equal one truth. Truly, when men turn away from the commandments of God, and are determined to abide by the "precept of men" their perceptions become blunted, and they

become unable to distinguish truth from error. In closing, we would say to all who desire to *establish* Sunday observance, that it cannot be done unless they can bring a "Thus saith the Lord" in support of it, because the storm that is coming will "sweep away the refuge of lies," but "the word of the Lord abideth forever." Nothing will stand that is not built upon this foundation. E. J. W.*SITI November 6, 1884, page 665.8*

"A Mixed Case" The Signs of the Times, 10, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

At the last Methodist conference in California a "Sabbath Committee" was appointed, whose report appeared in full in the *Advocate*. It is but just to state that the report as given was not adopted, but what the objections were is not stated. If they were against the first paragraph, which we quote below, we shall be happy to make them known if we are informed of them. Here it is:-*SITI November 6, 1884, page 665.9*

"Sabbath is made binding upon the human conscience by the law of God. Some statutory provisions, intended to impress the world with its holiness, passed away with the exigencies to which they were made specially to apply; but the fourth commandment is yet as binding as the first for the sixth. The decalogue is fundamental law. It is the constitution of the moral world, and the full force of its fourth section passed over to the first day of the Jewish week by the change which the Holy Spirit distinctly announced and the apostolic church adopted immediately after the resurrection."*SITI November 6, 1884, page 665.10*

It is doubtful if so great a medley of truth and error could be found in one paragraph of any subject except the Sabbath. The first half is straight enough. The law of God contains our rule for Sabbath observance. The statutory provisions, that were local and temporary, form no part of the fourth commandment, as is admitted above. Consequently their existence or non-existence in no wise affected the force or meaning of the fourth commandment. That, as the committee truthfully said, "is yet as binding as the first were the sixth." This being the case, it necessarily follows that all our

knowledge concerning the Sabbath must be derived from the fourth commandment.*SITI November 6, 1884, page 665.11*

Thus far we agree. But now, after stating that the decalogue is the constitution of the moral world, they add, “and the full force of its fourth section passed over to the first day of the Jewish week.” If that be so, then we must find some statement to that effect in the fourth commandment, or else must find it in an amendment to the constitution. Read the commandment: “Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work, but *the seventh day* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in *it* thou shalt not do any work; thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates.” This commandment, the committee say, is as binding as the first or the sixth. By what legerdemain do they make it uphold first-day observance when it mentions only the seventh day, and that explicitly? We would like to have that committee explain their words.*SITI November 6, 1884, page 665.12*

We will ask another question: What did the commandment mean when it was given? What day did it specify as the day of rest? All will admit that it was not the first but the seventh day of the week. The committee admitted this, when they said that the force of the fourth commandment “passed over” to the first day of the week. If any are in doubt as to just what day the Lord did point out by the commandment, let them read the sixteenth chapter of Exodus, and remember that the order of things therein stated continued forty years. For forty years the seventh day was marked by the regular occurrence of miracles. Now, then, another query: Since the wording of the commandment has not been changed, and it clearly designated the seventh day when it was given, how is it possible for it to mean the first day now? Can the same commandment teach one thing at one time, and another thing at another time? If it can, why could it not teach both things at the same time? And if it did that, would it really teach anything?*SITI November 6, 1884, page 665.13*

Let us try this mode of reasoning on the first commandment. That says, “Thou shalt have no other gods before me.” There is no mistaking who is meant by this commandment, for it is prefaced

with, "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." The living God is the one who thus claims supreme honor, and so it was and is understood. But we find that in after years the Jews, as an entire nation, forsook the Lord, and served Baal. For this cause God visited them with punishments. What a pity they did not have the wisdom of modern theologians, for then they could have said: "The decalogue is the constitution of the moral world, and the full force of its fourth section has passed over to Baal." We are not sure that this argument would have been of any advantage to them, for they doubtless had an abundance of the excuses with which to quiet their consciences, and we very much doubt if they could have brought the Lord over to their way of thinking by any such reasoning. But why should not the Lord be satisfied with that kind of obedience to the first commandment as well as to the fourth? We are certain that neither the *Advocate* nor the "Sabbath Committee," would be willing to allow that the first commandment justifies the Chinaman in his worship of Joss. And why not? Because it particularly specifies the God who is to receive our adoration. Very good. But the committee admit that the fourth commandment is as binding as the first; why then do they keep the first day when it enjoins the seventh? Can they give a satisfactory answer?*SITI November 6, 1884, page 665.*¹⁴

"But we have already given our authority," perhaps they will say. Let us look at it. They say concerning the decalogue that "the full force of its fourth section passed over to the first day of the Jewish week by the change which the Holy Spirit distinctly announced, and the apostolic church adopted immediately after the resurrection." We can only say that we have read The New Testament through more than once, and we never came across any such distinct announcement; and we have never seen any one that did. If that committee have some revelation from the Holy Spirit that other men have not, we think it is their duty to make it known. One thing is certain: neither Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, Peter, nor James, ever made that "distinct announcement" known.*SITI November 6, 1884, page 666.*¹

We think all candid persons will agree that the committee have not established their case. It must stand with the Scotch verdict of "not

proven.” To all who are inclined to accept their conclusions without proof, we would say, Be cautious how you proceed. God himself declares that he is a jealous God, and we are very sure that in the Judgment they will not be able to convince him that when he said one thing he meant something directly opposite. E. J. W.*SITI*
November 6, 1884, page 666.2

November 13, 1884

“The Sabbath-School” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST.—DEC. 6

1. When Christ was crucified, who were put to death with him? *Luke 23:32, 33.SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.1*

2. While they were hanging on the cross, what did one of the thieves do? *Verse 39.SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.2*

3. What did the other one do? *Verse 40.SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.3*

4. With what words did he rebuke his companion? *Verses 40, 41.SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.4*

5. To whom did the penitent thief address himself? *Verse 42.SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.5*

6. What request did he make? *Verse 42.SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.6*

7. What reply did Jesus make? *Verse 43.SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.7*

8. What is the midst of paradise? *Revelation 2:7.SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.8*

9. By the side of what river is the tree of life? *Revelation 22:1, 2.SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.9*

10. From what does the river of life proceed?*SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.10*

11. Then since both the tree and the river of life are in Paradise, where is God’s throne?*SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.11*

12. When people go to paradise, in whose presence do they go? *SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.12*

13. How long after Christ's crucifixion was the resurrection? *1 Corinthians 15:3, 4. SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.13*

14. On the morning of the resurrection what did he say to one of his disciples? *John 20:17. SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.14*

15. If he had not yet ascended to the father could he have been in Paradise on the day of this crucifixion? *SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.15*

16. Since Christ cannot deceive, can it be that he intended to meet the in Paradise three days before? *SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.16*

17. If not, why did he use the word "to-day"? *SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.17*

18. At what time did the thief want to be remembered? *Luke 23:42. SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.18*

19. When does Christ have his kingdom? *Matthew 25:31. SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.19*

20. And when will all who believe on him be with him? *John 14:3. SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.20*

21. Then to what time did the penitent thief look forward? *SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.21*

22. Will his request then be granted notwithstanding he is now dead? *1 Thessalonians 4:15-17. SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.22*

The lesson this week covers that much discussed passage. Christ's answer to the thief on the cross. Comments on this subject need not be extended to any great length, for if the texts referred to are each read carefully, and a comprehensive view of them all is then taken, there can be no difficulty in arriving at the true

interpretation. *SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.23*

In the first place we must consider the present and previous circumstances of the malefactor, and what it was for which he asked. One source of the popular error on this subject is the supposition that the thief had never before heard of Christ. Such a supposition is not probable. The wonderful thing about his action was which he manifested. But faith comes by hearing (*Romans 10:17*), and in no other way. So the thief must have heard of Christ and his mission. While others, even his chosen disciples, thought that Christ's career was ended, and that there was no hope of his saving any one, the thief grasped the great truths which Jesus had been trying to impress upon his followers, of a resurrection and a future coming in glory, when he would reward every man according to his deeds. In harmony with this new born hope, the penitent thief exclaimed, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." *SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.24*

It is evident that whatever might have happen to the thief that day would not be in answer to his request; for Christ did not have his kingdom that day. He himself had likened the kingdom of heaven to a nobleman that "went into a far country to receive for himself the kingdom, and to return." In the seventh of Daniel we learn that the kingdom is not given to the Son of man until all earthly kingdoms have run their course. When he receives the kingdom he will return. So he says, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, *then* shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." *Matthew 25:31*. And therefore Christians are instructed still to pray, "Thy kingdom come;" as yet they are only "*heirs* of the kingdom which God hath promised to them that love him." It is worthy of note in this connection that, according to Griesbach, *Luke 23:42* should read, "Lord, remember me in the day of the coming." *SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.25*

The next point to be noted is what the Lord promised. It was, "Thou shall be with me in Paradise? Where and what is paradise? A few words in answer must suffice. Paul plainly intimates (*2 Corinthians 12:2-4*), that it is in, or corresponds to, the third heaven. We can identify it still more closely. In *Revelation 2:7* we learn that the tree of life is "in the midst of the paradise of God." In *Revelation 22:1, 2*,

we learn further that the tree of life is on either side of their river of life. Then the river of life must also be in Paradise. From this same passage we also learn that the river of life proceeds from the throne of God, thus showing that the throne of God is in the midst of the Paradise of God. Whoever goes to Paradise must necessarily be in the presence of God. Christ's promise to the thief, then, was virtually this: "Thou shalt be with me in the presence of God." *SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.26*

Now what about the fulfillment of that promise? Was it fulfilled that day? or is its fulfillment still future? We can determine this in two ways: (1) By considering, as we have done, what an answer to the thief's request would imply, and (2) By examining the actual facts in the case. By the first we learned that if Christ intended his promise as a direct answer to the thief's request, then its fulfillment must still be future, because Christ's coming is still future. Now as to the recorded facts. On "the third day" after the crucifixion, as Mary, suddenly recognizing her risen Lord, was about to embrace him, Jesus said: "Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father." *John 20:17*. This at once settles the matter, for if he had not ascended to the Father, of course he did not go to Paradise-into his presence-three days before. But it is not possible that Jesus should have prevaricated in the least, for "he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth" (*1 Peter 2:22*); and therefore he did not go to Paradise on the day of his crucifixion, it must be that he did not promise the thief that he should be with him there that day. In the light of the facts of the case we are forced to conclude that they who think that Jesus and the thief met in Paradise on the day of the crucifixion, do not understand the Saviour's words to the thief. *SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.27*

Consider the circumstances under which Jesus uttered those words. He had told his disciples that he was the one spoken of by the prophets, who was to occupy the throne of David. He had told the twelve that when he should sit on the throne of his glory they also should sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Their hopes had been raised to the highest pitch when, but a few days before, he had entered Jerusalem in a triumphant manner, while the multitude waved palm branches before him. They had thought that their hour of triumph had come, and that he was then

to assume his kingdom. Instead of that, however, they had seen him taken by a cruel mob, hurried unresistingly from judgment-seat to judgment-seat, subjected to the most brutal insults, beaten, spit upon, and scourged, and finally fainting and under the load of a heavy cross, to which he was now fastened with huge nails, dying the death of the malefactor. The hopes of the disciples were blasted, and while they had all confidence in the integrity of their Master, they thought he had been deceived. To them the future looked dark and gloomy. Not so with Jesus. From the beginning of his earthly ministry he had foreseen this event; and his confidence in God's power to raise him from the dead, and in the final success of his mission,-that true suffering he should bring many sons into glory,-remained unshaken. And so when the penitent thief, with a faith that has seldom, if ever, been equaled, preferred his request, the mind of Jesus reached forward to the consummation of his work, and like a king he replied in words calculated to strengthen the faith of the petitioner, "I say unto thee *to-day*, thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Truly so royal a gift was never before promised under such untoward circumstances. *SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.28*

"But," some one will say, "the punctuation will not allow of such interpretation." Well, we have found that the words of Jesus himself will not allow any other interpretation, so what shall be done? Shall we preserve the present punctuation, and thus make Jesus contradict himself? or shall we alter the punctuation so that the passage will be in harmony with the after statement of Jesus, and with the rest of the inspired record? Reason and reverence would say the latter, because the punctuation is only the work of man, while the words of Jesus cannot disagree. If we just imagine ourselves back in the time when Luke wrote these words, or else that the art of punctuation has not yet been invented, our difficulty will vanish. Remembering that there were no marks of punctuation when the Bible was written, we can read the words of Jesus so that they will harmonize with other statements of Scripture. We will not say to change the position of the comma, but just drop it out, leaving the texts as it was originally written. Then read it, making the emphasis where a due regard for the harmony of the sacred word would suggest that it be made. Surely there is no more of presumption in dropping out a comma than there is in placing it

there in the first place. In fact, there is no presumption in either case. Those who placed it there doubtless thought that it was necessary to the sense. We, with clearer light on God's word, see that it destroys the sense, and read it in harmony with that clearer light. E. J. W. *SITI November 13, 1884, page 678.29*

"Everlasting Punishment" The Signs of the Times, 10, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

In our last article, based upon *Matthew 25:41*, we found that the "everlasting fire" into which the wicked are to be cast at the last day, will have the defect to "burn them up," so that they will "be ashes;" that the fire is "unquenchable," thus showing that there will be no hope of escape for those who are cast into it, but that it will continue to burn as long as there is anything left for it to feed upon. *SITI November 13, 1884, page 680.1*

We now come to the forty-sixth verse, and here we are obliged to make another stand, for so firmly is the doctrine of eternal torment fastened on the minds of men, that simple proof to the contrary is not sufficient, unless every text bearing upon the subject is examined, and shown to be in harmony with that proof. In summing up his discourse, the Saviour marks the final disposition of both the righteous and the wicked in these words: "And these [the wicked] shall go way into everlasting punishment; the righteous into life eternal." *SITI November 13, 1884, page 680.2*

In order to a perfect agreement on this text, we will state that the two words "everlasting" and "eternal" mean in this place exactly the same thing. They are both translated from the same Greek word. If, instead of two different words the translators had rendered both by the same word, making it either "eternal punishment" and "eternal life," or "everlasting punishment" and "everlasting life," it would have saved much unnecessary controversy. We are taught, then, from this text, that the punishment of the wicked is to last as long as does the reward of the righteous. This we most firmly believe. But it must be borne in mind that this verse conveys no intimation of what that punishment shall be. To say that one who violates a certain statute shall receive the penalty of the law, does not determine how,

nor to what extent, he is to be punished. It may be by fine, imprisonment, confiscation of goods, or death. In the text before us, however, we are told that the length of the punishment; it is to be as long as the reward of the righteous. *SITI November 13, 1884, page 680.3*

Now what is that punishment? Return to *Romans 6:23* and read: "The wages of sin is *death*; but the gift of God is eternal life to Jesus Christ our Lord." The punishment, then, is to be death; and since that punishment is to be everlasting, we conclude that eternal death will be the portion of the wicked. This agrees exactly with our previous investigation. As corroborating this conclusion, we cite *2 Thessalonians 1:7-9*: "And to you who are troubled [God will recompense] rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; who shall be punished with *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." This destruction comes "from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power," and this agrees with the eighth verse of the next chapter, which says: "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming." And this again is in harmony with the statement in Revelation, concerning the wicked: "And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city; and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them." *Revelation 20:9. SITI November 13, 1884, page 681.1*

That which has caused the misunderstanding in regard to *Matthew 25:46*, is the mistaken idea of the punishment. Because "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish," are threatened to "every soul of man that doeth evil" (*Romans 2:8, 9*), men seem to think that tribulation and anguish constitute the sum of the punishment. All these things are threatened, they are nowhere declared to be eternal, as in the death which is "the wages of sin." Everywhere in the Bible, death and life are the alternatives set before the individual. He may believe and live, or he may do evil and die. "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; in

that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, and to keep his commandments and his statutes and his judgments, that thou mayest live But if thine heart turn away, so that thou wilt not hear, but shalt be drawn away, and worship other gods, and serve them; I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish.... I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live.” *Deuteronomy 30:15-19.SITI November 13, 1884, page 681.2*

Whatever of anguish may be accessory, the above language shows that so surely as life shall be given to the obedient, death shall be the portion of the sinner. If not, what force is there in the words of the prophet: “Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit: for why will ye die, O house of Israel?” *Ezekiel 18:31*. Here the prophet, like Paul, “knowing the terror of the Lord,” persuades men to turn from sin. But his persuasion from that standpoint loses all its power if he has made a mistake as to what that “terror” is. Let it be borne in mind that the punishment-“the wages of sin”-is death. Until death has been inflicted upon the sinner, he has not *been punished*, however much he may suffer. Now the Saviour does not say that the wicked shall go into an everlasting condition of *being punished*, which would be everlasting dying, but into *everlasting punishment*, which is *everlasting death*. *SITI November 13, 1884, page 681.3*

The wise man has said, “There is a way which seemeth right unto a man; but the end thereof are the ways of death.” *Proverbs 14:12*. And the apostle James only repeats the statement in another form when he says: “Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bring a forth death.” *James 1:15*. In short, throughout the inspired record, we find only a repetition of our Saviour’s words: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not *perish*, but have everlasting life.” *John 3:16*. The death that was threatened to Adam, the execution of which was stayed that he might, by the aid of Christ, have another chance for life, still hangs over his posterity. They may escape from the “wrath to come” by believing in Christ, and thus becoming new creatures. If they do not accept this offer, the penalty will be allowed to fall upon their guilty heads. And

to these are the words of Christ: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." *John 3:36.SITI November 13, 1884, page 681.4*

"But the wrath of God *abideth* on him." Let us see how much force there may be in this statement. The second psalm is devoted to a brief history of those presumptuous mortals who "take counsel together against the Lord and against his Anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us." Unto these the Lord shall speak in his wrath, and he will vex them in his sore displeasure, even giving them to the Son to be broken with a rod of iron, and dashed in pieces like a potter's vessel. In view of this threatened punishment, they are exhorted to be instructed, and to repent, and believe on Christ; or, in the words of inspiration, to "kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and he perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little." *Psalms 2:12*. The wrath of God and of the Son is the same, for the Father hath "committed all judgment under the Son," and has given him authority to execute it. *John 5:22, 27*. Now what is the result of the manifestation of this wrath? Even when it is "kindled but a little," its effect is to cause those against whom it is directed to "*perish* from the way." Then if a slight manifestation of God's wrath will cause the sinner to "perish," *i.e.*, "to die; to be blotted from existence," what will be the effect if the wrath of God *abideth* on him? It can be nothing less than to keep him in everlasting death. And thus we find, from whatever portion of the Scripture we approach the subject, that the verdict is the same. The Lord "reserveth wrath for his enemies" (*Nahum 1:2*); the effect of that wrath, when let fall upon them, is to blot them from existence (*Psalms 2:12*); they will never afterward, to all eternity, have any existence. E. J. W.*SITI November 13, 1884, page 681.5*

"The Lord's Day" The Signs of the Times, 10, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

CONSIDERATION OF THE ARGUMENT FROM THE PRACTICE OF THE EARLY CHURCH

It will be remembered that our articles on the "Teaching of the Apostles" were called out by an article that appeared in the

Advance, making extravagant claims for that document, as for ever settling the Sunday question. Its argument was as follows: The “Teaching” exhorts all to come together on the Lord’s day to break bread and gives thanks; the disciples at Troas, with Paul, did on one occasion assemble on the first day of the week to break bread; and Justin Martyr said, in first apology to the Roman Senate, and that “on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gathered together to one place,’ etc. From these they arrived at the conclusion that when the apostle John said, “I was in the Spirit on a Lord’s day,” he intended by the term “the Lord’s day” to designate the first day of the week. This is a fair statement of the Sunday Lord’s-day position, which we designed to candidly examine. In this examination we have nothing to do with the so-called “Teaching of the Apostles,” because (1) we have already shown that it has not the slightest degree of authority, being the uninspired production of some unknown person, and (2) the expression “Lord’s day” nowhere occurs in that document, whether it be good or bad. The term “Lord’s day” is used, however, by the apostle, and people have a right to demand that teachers of the Bible tell whether he referred to the seventh or the first day.*SITI November 13, 1884, page 681.6*

The statement of Justin Martyr will be considered first. The reader will notice that even he does not say that the first day of the week was termed the Lord’s day, but uses the expression, “on the day called Sunday.” If that day had been regarded as sacred, some other title would have been bestowed. This, however, is of little consequence. The argument is that John speaks of the Lord’s day, and the fact that Christians of Justin Martyr’s time assemble on Sunday, proves that Sunday is the day which John had in mind. The reason why he spoke of it as “the day called Sunday” was, as is stated by the *Advance*, because it was called by the Romans “the day of the sun.”*SITI November 13, 1884, page 681.7*

This argument for Sunday as the Lord’s day would be a good one, and indeed conclusive, if it could be shown that the practices of Christians in the early centuries were always in harmony with the Scriptures. In order to make the argument of any account whatever, it must be shown that their customs were necessarily correct. But how shall we know whether or not their practices were correct? Only by comparing them with the Bible, for that alone contains the

rule of righteousness. Our Sunday friends, in their appeals to the practice of the early church, make the mistake of determining by the actions of men what the Bible teaches, when, instead of that, they ought to appeal to the Bible, to determine the correctness of those actions.*SITI November 13, 1884, page 681.8*

We will give a few quotations to show how little we can depend on the practices of Christians, even in the first centuries as exponents of a true Christian doctrine. First we quote the words of Paul. To the elders of the church at Ephesus, he said:-*SITI November 13, 1884, page 681.9*

“Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.” *Acts 20:28-30. SITI November 13, 1884, page 681.10*

Not only did he predict that there would be heresies taught in the church after his departing, but writing to the Thessalonians, he said, “For the mystery of the iniquity doth already work.” Church history, written by first-day authors, bears witness to the truth of Paul’s words. Mosheim, writing concerning the second century, says,-*SITI November 13, 1884, page 681.11*

“A large part, therefore, of the Christian but observances and institutions, even in this century, had the aspect of pagan mysteries.”-*Book I, Part II, chap. IV, sec. 5 SITI November 13, 1884, page 682.1*

Again he says:-*SITI November 13, 1884, page 682.2*

“There is good reason to suppose that the Christian bishops purposely multiplied sacred rites for the sake of rendering the Jews and pagans more friendly to them.”-*Book I, Cent. II, Part II, chap. IV, sec. 2. SITI November 13, 1884, page 682.3*

In a footnote to the above passage, Mosheim says further:-*SITI November 13, 1884, page 682.4*

“It will not be unsuitable to transcribe here a very apposite passage which I met with in Gregory Nyssa’s life of Gregory Thaumaturgus: ‘When Gregory perceived that the ignorant and simple multitude persisted in their idolatry, on account of the sensitive pleasures and delights it afforded, he allowed them, in celebrating the memory of the martyrs, to indulge themselves, and give a loose to pleasure (*i.e.*, as the thing itself and both what precedes and follows a place beyond all controversy, he allowed them in the sepulchres of the martyrs, on their feast days, to dance, to use sports, to indulge conviviality, and to do all things that the worshipers of idols were accustomed to do in their temples on their festival days), hoping that in process of time they would spontaneously come over to a more becoming and more correct manner of life.” *SITI November 13, 1884, page 682.5*

Such was the policy of the leaders of the church in the second century, this century in which Justin Martyr lived. Let anyone read the last quotation, and then read a description of the abominations practiced at even festivals, and he will hardly be willing to adopt any custom whatever on the example of such Christians. Sunday was so called by the Romans, because it was dedicated to the worship of the sun. Its Latin name was *Dies Solis*, day of the sun. Now if the bishops of the church, in their desire for “converts” from among the heathen, allowed them to observe their festivals with the most abominable orgies, is it to be considered a strange thing if they allowed them to retain the very day of one of their festivals? If they did not scruple to multiply rites and ceremonies to suit the superstitions of the ignorant crowd, certainly they would not hesitate to accept one that was already in use. *SITI November 13, 1884, page 682.6*

Thus far we have simply shown that we are not to be influenced in favor of any custom because it was practiced by the early Christians. Their course determines nothing for us. We will therefore leave them, and in our next article will allow the Bible to determine which day of the week is the Lord’s day. E. J. W. *SITI November 13, 1884, page 682.7*

November 20, 1884

“The Sabbath-School” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST.—DEC. 13

1. Upon whom did Christ pronounce a special blessing? *Matthew 5:10.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.1*
2. For what did Peter say it was better to suffer? *1 Peter 3:17.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.2*
3. For what did Christ once suffer? *Verse 18.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.3*
4. For whose sins did he suffer? *Isaiah 53:5.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.4*
5. Why did he thus suffer? *1 Peter 3:18.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.5*
6. How did he suffer for our sins? *Ib.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.6*
7. By what was he made alive? *Ib.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.7*
8. To whom is it said that Christ preached? *Verse 19.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.8*
9. By what agency did he preach to the spirits in prison? *Verses 18, 19.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.9*
10. But who are they who walk at liberty? *Psalms 119:45.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.10*
11. Who may be said to be in prison? *SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.11*

12. When was it that Christ by the Spirit preached to those disobedient ones? *1 Peter 3:20.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.12*

13. Did the Spirit of God indeed strive with the antediluvians? *Genesis 6:3.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.13*

14. When did the Spirit cease to strive with them?*SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.14*

15. To what place do the dead go? *Psalms 16:10.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.15*

16. Where did Christ go before he ascended to Heaven?*Ephesians 4:9.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.16*

17. Did the same Jesus that ascended to Heaven also descend into the grave? *Ephesians 4:10.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.17*

18. Did the soul of Christ go into the grave (*hades*) ? *Acts 2:29-32.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.18*

19. What Scripture proof can you give that Christ did not preach while in the grave?*SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.19*

20. When we read that Christ suffered for sin, “being put to death,” does it mean that the soul of Christ suffered even to death? *Matthew 26:38; Isaiah 53:10, 12.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.20*

21. What had the Lord promised concerning death? *Isaiah 25:8.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.21*

22. How only could he destroy death? *Hebrews 2:14.SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.22*

23. If Christ himself had not died, what would be the condition of the human race?*SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.23*

The Scripture which calls out the texts that compose this lesson, is *1 Peter 3:18-20*. The text itself teaches a lesson far different from that which is commonly supposed to teach, and the design of the

lesson is to correct this mistaken idea. The apostle exhorts Christians to be patient under reproach, even though it be unjust, citing the example of Christ, who, though sinless, suffered for sins, “the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went in preached and to the spirits in prison.” It is concerning this last expression that the misapprehension exists, people supposing that because preaching to the spirits in prison is introduced almost immediately after the death of Christ is spoken of, therefore Christ must have preached to those spirits after his crucifixion and before his resurrection. If this supposition be true, then our previous teaching concerning the state of man has been at fault; therefore we will study the text carefully. *SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.24*

It would be well for those who hold to the theory that Christ immediately after his crucifixion went and preached to the spirits in *hades*, to compare this text with *Luke 23:43*, which was studied last week. It is claimed from that text that Christ went at once to Paradise; yet the same persons claim from *1 Peter 3:18-20* that Christ went to some place where the dead were congregated, and preached to them. If one theory be true, the other cannot be. A little examination of this passage will show us that no statement whatever is made in it concerning the condition of Christ between his death and resurrection. *SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.25*

Notice that the statement concerning his preaching to the spirits in prison does not immediately follow the statement that he was put to death. Between these two is the statement that he was “quickened”-made alive. So if we follow the order of the apostle’s statements, we find that the preaching was done while Christ was alive. But on reading the verses still more closely, we find that Jesus did not preached in person at all. It was by the Spirit that he preached. The apostle, having introduced the sufferings of Christ, mentions the fact that he was put to death. But the Bible writers always connect the death and the resurrection of Christ. They do not have Christ put to death, and then leave him. So he says, “put to death in the flesh, but quickened,”-made alive. This is not all, he was “quickened by the Spirit; by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison.” The verse teaches simply that the Spirit which raised Christ

from the dead, is the very same spirit by which Christ preached to the imprisoned spirits. *SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.26*

Now when did this preaching take place? The twentieth verse contains the answer. "When the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." Turning to *Genesis 6:3*, we read: "And the Lord said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh: yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years." Thus we find a harmony between the two passages; the Spirit of the Lord was striving with the antediluvians. Christ was preaching to them, through Noah, but all true preaching is accompanied by the Spirit of God. It is the Spirit that impresses the truth of God upon the heart, and convinces of sin. *SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.27*

"But," says one, "you forget that those to whom Christ preached by the Spirit, were in prison." No, we do not. For what purpose was the Spirit upon Christ when he was here on earth? In *Luke 4:16-21* we read that Christ read *Isaiah 61:1, 2*, and said, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." That scripture reads: "The spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to [them that are] bound." Who are these captives? David says, "I will walk at liberty; for I seek thy precepts." *Psalms 119:45*. And from that we would conclude that all others are not at liberty. So Peter says of false teachers, and those who are inspired by them: "While they promise them liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption; for of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage." *2 Peter 2:19*. Paul also teaches that if a man yields himself to sin, he is the servant of sin. *Romans 6:16, 17*; and in *Romans 7:15-24* he gives a graphic description of the struggles of one who is seeking to escape from the cruel bondage of sin. At last he finds liberty in Christ; his servants alone are free men. So then all sinners are in prison; they have transgressed the law of God, and where the laws are not a nullity, transgressors are always consigned to prison. Through faith in Christ, they may get liberty. But this liberty is contingent on their obedience to the law. The Spirit presses the claims of the law home to the heart, and when the sinner repents and accepts the way of truth, the Spirit

abides with him. See *Romans 8:7-14*. In Noah's time "the wickedness of man was great" (*Genesis 6:5*); and therefore the Spirit, through the preaching of Noah, was striving to have them repent and find true liberty. *SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.28*

It is not alone for the bearing that the popular theory of this text has on the Bible doctrine of immortality, that it deserves notice. There is a deeper reason. The popular interpretation of both *1 Peter 3:18-20*, and *Luke 23:43*, but only makes these texts contradictory, but overthrows the foundation principles of the gospel. In what way? By virtually denying the death of Christ. When man had sinned, he could not save himself. He could not by any obedience atone for his own sin. Neither would the life of one man answer for the life of another, for all have forfeited their lives by sin. Human sacrifices, then, would avail no more than with the blood of bulls and goats. Nothing but the life of a divine being, one who was sinless, and the giving of the law, could answer for man. Such an one was which Christ. He offered himself freely, not because law had any claim on his life, but that his righteousness might be counted instead of the past transgressions of those who should believe in him, and obey him. But now they tell us that Christ, the divine Son of God, did not die; that only his earthly, human body died, if that be so, then indeed is our faith vain, and we are yet in our sins. With the sorrowing Mary we may say, "They hath taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him." An interpretation that makes such a conclusion necessary should not be held for a moment by those who profess to love the Lord. *SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.29*

That Christ himself did die, there is abundant proof. Aside from the texts which say that the dead know not anything, we have special statements concerning Christ. The Jesus that "ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things," who now sits at the right hand of God, there making intercession for us, is the same Jesus who "descended first into the lower parts of the earth." *Ephesians 4:9, 10*. Not merely his human body, but his soul, which certainly must include his divinity, went into the grave. As we read in *Acts 2:29-31*, David did not, in the sixteenth psalm, speak of himself, but, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath that he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne, "He

seeing this before spake of *the resurrection of Christ* that *his soul was not left in hell [hades, the grave]*, neither did his soul see corruption.” If, by the resurrection, the soul of Christ was not left in the grave, then it must previously have gone into the grave. Christ himself declared in the garden that his soul was “exceeding sorrowful; even unto death,” and this is just in harmony with the prophet’s statement that he “poured out his soul unto death.” *Isaiah 53:12*. By death alone could he “destroy him which had the power of death, that is, the devil.” *Hebrews 2:14*. So then, notwithstanding the theories of man, “the foundation of God standeth sure,” viz., that “Christ died for the ungodly.” E. J. W. *SITI November 20, 1884, page 678.30*

“Punishment of the Wicked” The Signs of the Times, 10, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

“FOREVER AND EVER”

There is one text that should have received attention in connection with the article concerning the “everlasting fire” into which the wicked are to be cast. Before introducing it, however, and we will briefly review the points already made. *SITI November 20, 1884, page 696.1*

1. Those only who accept Christ receive eternal life; all others perish. *John 3:16*. That is, they will be blotted from existence. This is the penalty which was threatened in the beginning, before sin entered, and which is now simply delayed a little in order to allow mankind an opportunity to repent. Thus it is that “the long suffering of our Lord is salvation.” *2 Peter 3:15*. *SITI November 20, 1884, page 696.2*

2. The agent by which the death penalty is to be executed, is fire—“everlasting fire.” We saw that it was “eternal fire” that destroyed the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah (*Jude 7*), and that by means of “unquenchable fire” the walls and palaces of Jerusalem were devoured. *Jeremiah 17:27; 2 Chronicles 36:18-21*. We learned also that the “eternal fire” that fell upon the cities of the plain turned them to ashes (*2 Peter 2:6*), and that this is what is always accomplished

when fire is unquenchable. The wicked being likened to chaff, and stubble, it does not tax our imagination in the least to understand how, when cast into unquenchable fire, they will be burned up, and be ashes. *Matthew 3:12; Malachi 4:1, 3.SITI November 20, 1884, page 696.3*

3. We have also seen that the wicked go into “everlasting punishment.” But this punishment is death (*Romans 6:23*), so that *Matthew 25:46* simply teaches that from the death which the finally impenitent suffer, there will be no resurrection. This point was still further shown by the statement in *Psalms 2:12*, that even a slight manifestation of God’s wrath causes the one against whom it is directed to perish, and that since that wrath *abides* on the sinner (*John 3:36*) there will be no recovery from that perdition.*SITI November 20, 1884, page 696.4*

The texts already cited are amply sufficient to prove the final utter destruction of the wicked; but we have no desire to evade the point, or to pass by any text which would seem to militate against the positions taken. We therefore turn our attention to *Revelation 14:9-11*: “And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever: and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name.”*SITI November 20, 1884, page 696.5*

The question is, Does the expression, “the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever,” necessarily imply that the torments of the wicked will never cease? If it does, then there is an unexplainable contradiction between it and those texts which speak plainly of the final extinction of the wicked. But this cannot possibly be; it cannot for a moment be admitted that there are contradictions in the sacred record. This text, then must harmonize with the great mass of testimony already quoted. We might quote authorities on the meaning of the Greek word rendered “forever,” but we shall let

the Bible explain this text, just as we have all the others, for it is only when men take it by itself, without regard to other Scriptures, that it presents any objection to the position we have taken in regard to the destruction of the wicked. In the twenty-first chapter of Exodus, the first four verses, we find the law in regard to the length of the time a Hebrew might be kept as a servant. Six years was the limit; after he had served six years, his master was bound to let him go free, for nothing, and allow him to take away as much as he brought with him. If during his term of service he had married one of his master's servants, she and her children were to remain with the master. In such a case, however, it would often happen that the servant would rather stay with his wife and children than have his liberty; if so, the law made the following provision:-*SITI November 20, 1884, page 696.6*

“And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free; then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and *he shall serve him for ever.*” *Exodus 21:5, 6. SITI November 20, 1884, page 697.1*

Now will anyone claim that the life of that servant, as well as that of his master, was to be prolonged to all eternity? Certainly not; no one can be found who would gather from the above text that either the servant or his master would live any longer than a natural life-time. The text simply teaches that under the special circumstances mentioned, the servant should remain with his master and serve him continuously, as long as he should live. So we find that “forever” does not necessarily mean “to all in eternity.” *SITI November 20, 1884, page 697.2*

Take another instance: In *Isaiah 34:9, 10*, we read, concerning the land, here called “Idumea,” as follows: “And the streams thereof shall be turned into pitch, and the dust thereof into brimstone, and the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up for ever; from generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it for ever and ever.” In a similar strain the prophet continues to the close of the chapter; and then we have read: “The

wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them; and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the rose. It shall blossom abundantly, and rejoice even with joy and singing: the glory of Lebanon shall be given unto it, the excellency of Carmel and Sharon, they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the excellency of our God.” *Isaiah 35:1, 2*. These words are spoken of the same land from which, in the preceding chapter, it is that the smoke should ascend for ever. So we see that there does come a time when the smoke does not arise from it; and that is when “the indignation of the Lord upon all nations” shall have been accomplished. Thus again we find that “forever,” even “forever and ever,” does not necessarily imply that there shall be no end. *SITI November 20, 1884, page 697.3*

This text is the more important to note, as it has a direct bearing on *Revelation 14:11*. The time when the smoke shall thus ascend for ever, is “the day of the Lord’s vengeance, and the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion” (*Isaiah 34:8*), and the time when “the indignation of the Lord is upon all nations” (*verse 2*). This being so, and the fact having been proved that the land does afterward cease burning, and become renewed, we find that we are positively bound to admit that there will come a time when the smoke of the torment of the rebellious ones will cease; and that the statement that it shall ascend for ever and ever, means, as in the other two cases cited, but that it will ascend *continuously*, as long as there is any wicked in existence. There will be no reprieve in their case, or relaxing of the punishment. The fire which causes the smoke is unquenchable; it utterly devours the sinners; but when they have been *devoured*, and have become ashes, then the fire will of necessity cease to burn, and likewise the smoke will cease to ascend. *SITI November 20, 1884, page 697.4*

Read the verses (*Revelation 14:9-11*) once more. They (the rebellious ones) “shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture.” In our last article we learned (*Psalms 2:12*) the effect of the wrath of God when it is kindled even a little against the people of the earth; is to cause them to “perish,”-“to come to nothing.” Now if the wicked are made to drink of the “wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture,” certainly the result can be nothing less than their utter destruction. *SITI*

We are not attempting to fix the duration of the “tribulation and anguish” which the wicked shall suffer previous to their death, nor to limit it in any way. The statement that “they have no rest day nor night,” implies that it will not be of short duration. That they will suffer anguish for a long time, there can be no doubt; neither can there be any more doubt that this anguish which will eventually be terminated by death; “for the wages of sin is death;” “sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.” If we insist that the torments of the wicked never cease, then these texts have no meaning. Yet it must be borne in mind that there is no restoration to the favor of God. No; the wicked shall “go away into everlasting punishment,” even “everlasting destruction.” *SITI November 20, 1884, page 697.6*

Revelation 14:10 is not the only place where the “wine of the wrath of God” is mentioned. In *Jeremiah 25:15* we read: “For thus saith the Lord God of Israel unto me; Take the wine cup of this fury at my hand, and cause all the nations, to whom I send thee, to drink it.” The different nations that shall drink of it are then specified, and the list closes with these words: “And all the kings of the north, far and near, one with another, and *all the kingdoms of the world*, which are upon the face of the earth.” *Verse 26*. This corresponds with *Psalms 75:8*: “For in the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and the wine is red; it is full of mixture; and he poureth out of the same: but the dregs thereof, *all the wicked* of the earth shall wring them out, and drink them.” Now what will be the result of their drinking of this cup? We turn again to the prophecy in Jeremiah:-*SITI November 20, 1884, page 697.7*

“Therefore thou shalt say unto them, Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Drink ye, and be drunken, and spue, *and fall, and rise no more*, because of the sword which I will send among you. And it shall be, if they refuse to take the cup at thine hand to drink, then shalt thou say unto them, Thus saith the Lord of hosts; ye shall certainly drink. For, lo, I begin to bring evil on the city which is called by my name, and should ye be utterly unpunished? Ye shall not be unpunished: for I will call for a sword upon all the inhabitants of the earth, saith the Lord of hosts.” “A noise shall come even to the ends of the earth; for the Lord hath a controversy with the nations, he will

plead with all flesh; he will give them that are wicked to the sword, saith the Lord." "And the slain of the Lord shall be at that day from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth; they shall not be lamented, neither gathered, nor buried; they shall be dung upon the ground." *Jeremiah 25:27-29, 31, 33.* *SITI November 20, 1884, page 697.8*

Thus we see that the drinking of the wine of the wrath of God produces death. They who drink it "fall, and rise no more." This is perfectly in harmony with what we have previously learned of the effect of God's wrath, when it abideth on the sinner. But there is one more text to be noticed in this connection, which settles the case absolutely. It is *Obadiah 15, 16*, which reads thus:-*SITI November 20, 1884, page 697.9*

"For the day of the Lord is near upon all the heathen; as thou hast done, it shall be done unto thee; thy reward shall return upon thine own head. For as ye have drunk upon my holy mountain, so shall all the heathen drink continually, yea, *they shall drink*, and they shall swallow down, and *they shall be as though they had not been.*" *SITI November 20, 1884, page 697.10*

What stronger language could be used to show the final *utter extinction* of the wicked? And let it be remembered that this language is used concerning those who drink of "the wine up the wrath of God," threatened in *Revelation 14:9-11*. Certainly all must agree, then, that this latter text, instead of teaching the endless torture of the wicked, plainly shows that day, after suffering for an unknown length of time the "tribulation and anguish" which is their just due, and finally receive the full wages of sin, which is death. E. J. W. *SITI November 20, 1884, page 697.11*

"The Lord's Day" The Signs of the Times, 10, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

"I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet." *Revelation 1:10*. Strange as the statement dwell may appear, an examination of this text involves an answer to the question, "Who is the Lord?" Indeed, it may be said that this

question covers a large portion of the ground at issue. The fact is not going to any difficulty in the text itself, but solely to the position taken by those who have appropriated the term "Lord's day" to the first day of the week. They have made the settlement of the question as to what day is meant by the expression "Lord's day" depend on something which is not, or ought not to be in dispute at all. This fact will be more clearly seen by the following, from an article entitled "The Lord's Day," which was sent to us sometime ago for review:-*SITI November 20, 1884, page 697.12*

"To learn what day is the Lord's day, it is necessary to know who is the Lord. Adventists deny that Jesus is Lord, therefore they are prepared to deny that that day which gives Jesus must honor is the Lord's day."*SITI November 20, 1884, page 697.13*

If the writer of the above knew anything at all about Seventh-day Adventist (for of course they are the Adventists to whom he refers), he well knew that he was penning a falsehood when he wrote it. It is a good sample, however, of the method of argument (?) by which Sunday has been exalted to, and maintained in, its present position in the professed Christian world. Instead of going directly to the point, and bringing proved-Bible proof-that Sunday is the Lord's day, its adherents attempt to turn the mind away from a consideration of the real question at issue. They erroneously assume that if Christ is Lord, then Sunday must be the Lord's day; then they assert that Adventists deny the divinity of Christ. The result is that, in the minds of those whom they can induce to believe their statements, a very natural prejudice is aroused against the Adventist; and in proportion as they become prejudiced against Seventh-day Adventists, they increase in devotion to any institution or practice to which Seventh-day Adventists are opposed. But there is no more reason in the assumption that, because Christ is Lord, therefore Sunday is the Lord's day, than there would be in the assumption that, because Noah built the ark, therefore he must have been the discoverer of America. And the statement that Seventh-day Adventists deny that Christ is Lord, is nothing less than willful of falsehood. Such methods are adopted only by a man who are conscious that they have no proof for their theory, yet are determined to sustain it at all hazards. Macaulay says that whenever people have made up their minds without knowing why,

“discussion ends in scurrility, the last resource of the disputant who cannot answer, and who will not submit.” *SITI November 20, 1884, page 697.14*

The inspired prophet exclaimed: “O Israel, thy prophets [teachers] are like the foxes in the deserts.” *Ezekiel 13:4*. The marked characteristic of the fox is craftiness. He will cover up his trail, and resort to various devices to throw the hunters off his track. His characteristic cunning is manifested in deceiving his pursuers as to his relocation, causing them to think that he is in a certain hole when he is far distant. That the prophet, by this figure, aptly describes the supporters of the Sunday-Sabbath, is evident to one who has studied their tactics. Take the case before us, for instance. They accuse us of denying the divinity of Christ in order to divert attention to the real question at issue, and also to conceal the fact that they themselves in reality deny his divinity. For proof of this last statement we offer the following:—*SITI November 20, 1884, page 697.15*

It is readily conceded that the seventh-day Sabbath was appointed by God himself at Sinai; this is not denied by those who will not allow that it was given at creation. Further, they do not claim that God ever appointed any other day. But they do claim that Sunday should be observed in honor of Christ, and that he sanctioned, if he did not institute, such observance. Thus they make the Father and the Son antagonistic to each other, or, to say the least, they have each one working on a plan of his own, and for his own pleasure. But this is utterly at variance with the truth uttered by Christ, “I and my Father are one.” *John 10:30*. Unity with the Father is an essential part of the divinity of Christ; and therefore to claim that Christ engaged in a thing that the Father did not, or that he has any interest separate from the Father, is to deny that perfect unity, and, consequently, to deny the divinity of Christ. Since the question of the divinity of Christ is made a prime factor in determining this matter of the Lord’s day, the remainder of this article will be devoted to that point. *SITI November 20, 1884, page 698.1*

Christ says, “I and my Father are one.” This we must accept as an absolute fact in the sense in which he designed it. He prayed to the Father for his disciples, “that they may be one, even as we are

one." *John 17:22*. The union between the Father and the Son is the same as should exist between brethren in the faith. It is a union of thought and purpose. See *1 Corinthians 1:10*. The will of one is the will of the other. The language of Christ was, "I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart." *Psalms 40:8*. Again, "Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself: but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works." *John 14:10*. A closer union than this cannot be imagined. So close is the union that Christ is called God, as in *Isaiah 9:6*, and *Titus 2:13*. In talking with the young man (*Matthew 19:16, 17*) he himself plainly showed his right to be called God. The apostle Paul, speaking of Christ, says that "in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily." *Colossians 2:9*. *SITI November 20, 1884, page 698.2*

This fact of the unity of the Father and the Son, must of necessity be true at all times, and under all circumstances. Let us see. Jesus is known as the Saviour, the Redeemer of the world. It is through his blood that we have redemption (*Colossians 1:14*), and besides his name there is no salvation in any other. *Acts 4:12*. But if he and the Father are one, the Father must have had an equal share in the work of redemption. And so it is. The plan of salvation was not devised and executed by Christ apart from the Father. It is God's love that is commended to us in the death of Christ. *Romans 5:8*. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." *John 3:16*. When Christ was on earth he was doing the Father's work, for he said, "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish *his* work." *John 4:34*. And in harmony with this idea were his words to Mary, "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" *Luke 2:49*. The message that he bore was from the Father. He himself said, "My doctrine is not mine, but His that sent me" (*John 7:16*): "For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak." *John 12:49*. And so Paul says that "God was in Christ, reconciling the world under himself." *2 Corinthians 5:19*. Therefore whatever memorials of redemption are observed, must be in honor of God as well as of Christ. *SITI November 20, 1884, page 698.3*

Again, God is best known as the Creator of the world. This, indeed, is that for which he would be remembered, for his creative power is that which distinguishes him from false gods. See *Jeremiah 10:10-12*; *Psalms 96:5*; *2 Corinthians 8:5*, *6*; *Acts 14:15*. But if Christ and the Father are one, then Christ must have shared equally with the Father in his work of creation. And so he did. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.... All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made." *John 1:1-3*. Of the One through whose blood we have redemption, Paul says that "by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: *all things were created by him*, and for him; and he is before all things, and *by him all things consist*." *Colossians 1:16, 17*. And finally, Paul exhibits the unity of Father and Son in both creation and redemption, in these words: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days *spoken unto us by his Son*, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, *by whom also he made the worlds*." *Hebrews 1:1, 2*. Thus we learn that it was through Christ that God made the world, and through Christ that God conveyed to lost man his message of mercy. In Christ God's will is made known and executed, and thus it is that he is called "the Word of God." *SITI November 20, 1884, page 698.4*

When we say that all Seventh-day Adventists hold to the truths taught by these scriptures as cardinal points of faith, it will be readily perceived that a denial of the divinity of Christ is not one of their peculiarities. With Peter they believe that God hath made this same Jesus who was crucified "both Lord and Christ;" and they also gladly acknowledge that fact "that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father." *John 5:23*. In what way they should honor him, will be shown next week. E. J. W. *SITI November 20, 1884, page 698.5*

November 27, 1884

“Helps in Studying the Lesson” The Signs of the Times, 10, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

The question has been asked, “At what time in the study of the Sabbath-school lessons should *helps* be brought in, and how should they be used?” To this question it is difficult to get an answer in a few words. In order to have a thorough knowledge of the subject, it would be necessary to have a clear understanding of what is meant by “helps;” but that must be waived for the present. We will suppose it to include the concordance, dictionaries, atlas, commentaries, histories, etc. Some will derive help from that which would be of no service to others. Taking it for granted that the things at hand are such as may be a help indeed, we would mark out, in brief, the following as a good plan for starting the lesson:-*SITI November 27, 1884, page 710.1*

Having learned from the lesson paper what the lesson is about, and what portion of Scripture it covers, take the Bible at once, there is where you will find the lesson to be studied. Read carefully, several times, all the texts that are quoted, so as to get them well in mind. The next step will be to commit to memory the portion that is to be memorized. This, of course, will not be accomplished at one effort; to commit the text thoroughly will be a work covering the whole week. If the student wishes, and is able, he may commit the whole of the lesson to memory; this is done by some, with profit. But it is not best to attempt too much at once. It is not the desire to tax the memory to such an extent that earnest thought cannot be put upon the matter thus committed.*SITI November 27, 1884, page 710.2*

While thus learning the texts referred to, the student should bear in mind the object for which they are quoted. Very often many things may be learned from a single verse; the question will indicate for what particular thing the verses is quoted. Then after learning the answers to each individual question, the lesson should be considered as a whole, to see the relation of the questions to one another, and what general point is made by the whole lesson. When this has been done, the student is ready to consult outside

helps. *SITI November 27, 1884, page 710.3*

In the matter of consulting commentaries, great care and judgment must be exercised, as on doctrinal points they are often misleading. It is not safe for any one to consult commentaries indiscriminately, unless he is previously pretty well grounded in the truth. Commentaries are more for the learned than the unlearned. If one has a good general idea of the subject which he is studying, and is anchored to certain fixed principles, so that he can sift the chaff from the wheat, he will learn much from commentaries. It often happens that a positively erroneous exposition will awaken a train of thought in the mind of the careful student, that will be very profitable. Those, however, who are most familiar with commentaries, know that quite often the text upon which the student most needs light, is the one upon which the least is said. The reasons for this is obvious. It is perhaps needless to suggest that if there is any work bearing on the lesson, of whose orthodoxy you are fully assured, that is the one to be consulted first. It will aid your judgment in your further search. *SITI November 27, 1884, page 710.4*

One "help" should never be neglected. It is that of the Holy Spirit. It is the author of the Bible (*2 Peter 1:20, 21; Ephesians 6:17*), and can best give light upon it. One of its offices is to guide into all truth (*John 16:13*), and it may be had by any one for the asking. *Luke 11:13; Mark 11:24*. The promise, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men literally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him," is given to all. This help should be sought before beginning the lesson, and during all the time of studying it. One thing more: The Saviour has said, "If any man will do his will he shall know of the doctrine." He who earnestly and prayerfully studies the word, with a sincere desire to profit by it, cannot fail to be enlightened. Jesus also said: "If a man love me, he will keep my words; and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." *John 14:23*. Now we read that "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." When *John 1:5*. If then he dwells in us, what an all-powerful, ever-present help we have. Without this help, all others are worthless. E. J. W. *SITI November 27, 1884, page 710.5*

E. J. Waggoner

The advice which we have to give is not our own, but is a bit that we found in a book written more than eighteen hundred years ago. It is contained in the following words of Paul to Timothy: “But foolish and unlearned questions avoid, knowing that they do gender strifes.” 2 Timothy 2:23. If every school would have this verse engrossed in large letters, suitably framed, and hung in a conspicuous place in the classroom, we believe that it would be to its benefit. There is no school in which is not needed as a warning, if not as a reproof. *SITI November 27, 1884, page 713.1*

We would by no means be understood as deprecating a spirit of investigation, or as advocating the shutting off of questions, except such as are indicated in the verse quoted. They are certain death to spirituality either in the school, the teachers’ meeting, or anywhere else. It is a lamentable fact that among any body of persons there will be some whose minds always grasp the fact that is not under consideration. A text of Scripture always conveys to them a hidden meaning, and they feel called upon to make known their doubts, or their new ideas. Others are always reaching out after the unattainable. They want to know more than is revealed. The question as to where Cain got his wife is still current. “Who was Melchizedek?” is asked with as much anxiety as though eternal happiness depended on the correct answer. The question, “How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come?” is still put in spite of the fact that the inspired apostle has marked the mental ability of the questioner down to zero. *SITI November 27, 1884, page 713.2*

There is no end to these foolish and unlearned questions. We mention (though not without a blush) a case that occurred in a Sabbath-school which we recently visited. In the course of the lesson, *Genesis 7:14, 15* was quoted as a proof text. At the close of the hour, when the leader inquired if any one had a question to ask concerning the lesson, one pupil rose and with much seriousness asked to know the difference between a bird and a fowl (!), since both words occur in *Genesis 7:14*. It will be said that this is an

extreme case, and that so foolish a question is seldom asked. No doubt it is an extreme case, and if the question had been only *asked* we would not mention it; but there were no less than half a dozen persons who were unguarded enough to offer *answers*. It was this fact that convinced us that the bit of advice which we have quoted is greatly needed. *SITI November 27, 1884, page 713.3*

In the current lessons in the SIGNS, on immortality, there is room for an abundance of unlearned questions. Some will want to know *how* the Spirit can return to God. Others will demand, or offer to give, an exact definition of the terms “soul” and “spirit.” “How is it that the dead can hear the voice of God?” is a question that worries not a few. “What is life?” will probably be asked until mortals reach the state where they will not dissipate their intellectual powers by employing them on unprofitable questions. *SITI November 27, 1884, page 713.4*

“They do gender strifes.” The strifes do not always appear; in fact, we seldom hear of them in Sabbath-school, nevertheless strifes is the legitimate result of such questions. The reason is that there is nothing to decide the question at issue. There is nothing to which either party to the discussion can appeal as a final authority. The opinion of one is of as much value as that of another, and none are worth anything. If the discussion of such questions does not lead to strife, it is solely because the parties have enough grace in their hearts to yield a point, or let the matter drop. *SITI November 27, 1884, page 713.5*

As a general thing, the subject matter of the lesson will suffice to fill all the time allowed. If something in the lesson brings to one’s mind a text outside of the lesson, which throws additional light upon it, by all means let him speak of it for the benefit of others. The object of every lesson is to stimulate, not to repress, thought. If the leader sees that the text has no bearing, he can state that fact in a few words, and in a manner not to wound feelings of many. It may chance that the leader’s judgment is at fault, and that the text is to the point, but so long as he is leader he must be allowed to direct the course of the lesson. In a company of earnest students there will be no dearth of good thoughts, and it would be better to let one or two be lost, than to have a discussion to no profit. If a theory can

be supported by Scripture, it must be good, but *guesses* concerning the Bible do not amount to much.*SITI November 27, 1884, page 713.6*

As we before said, these questions are usually dropped before they develop into strife; but of what profit are they? Are there not enough *revealed truths* in God's word to occupy all our powers of mind, without frittering them away on foolish questions, or those to which no answer can be given, and which, even if answered, are of no practical importance? Time is too precious to spend on trifles, and therefore let us always and everywhere heed the apostle's admonition: "Foolish and unlearned questions avoid." E. J. W.*SITI November 27, 1884, page 713.7*

"The Lord's Day.' (Continued.)" The Signs of the Times, 10, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

(Continued.)

In our further investigation of this subject, we shall understand that the word "Lord" is applied both to the Father and the Son, and that even though we find it in various places applied specifically to one of them, the act predicated of that one is the act of the other also. We have seen that there is no working at cross purposes between the two, but that they are "one" in every thought and act. It is sometimes claimed, in connection with *Revelation 1:10*, that in the New Testament Jesus only is called "Lord," some other title being invariably applied to the Father. One text (*Revelation 11:15*) is sufficient to disprove that claim: "And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever." Here there can be no question but that "Lord" refers to the Father especially. In one verse in the Old Testament (*Psalms 110:1*), the word is applied to both Father and Son: "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit down at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." But in this case, the Hebrew has a different word for each; but in *Revelation 11:15* the word for Lord is *Kurios*, the same that is used throughout the New Testament.*SITI November 27, 1884, page 713.8*

From *John 5:23* we learn “that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father.” Wherever, then, we find an act enjoined by the Father, we know that the performance of that act honors the Son also, and that the neglecting of it is as much an insult to the Son as to the Father. Disobedience to the Father dishonors Christ. Now turn to *Isaiah 58:13, 14* and we shall find one way in which we are to honor God: “If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.” *SITI November 27, 1884, page 713.9*

In this text the Lord, through his prophet, speaks of “my holy day.” So it is the “Lord’s day” that is under consideration. The text shows that the Lord claims but one day as his own, because it does not say “my holy days,” nor “one of my holy days,” but “*my holy day.*” From this we also learn that the “Lord’s day” is *holy*. And still further, we learn that this holy, Lord’s day is the Sabbath: “If thou turn away thy foot from the *Sabbath*, from doing thy pleasure on my *holy day*; and call the Sabbath a delight, the *holy of the Lord*, honourable,” etc. Now turn to *Exodus 20:8-11*, and you will find all these things combined, and in addition will be told exactly what day of the week this holy Sabbath-the Lord’s day-is:-*SITI November 27, 1884, page 714.1*

“Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.” *SITI November 27, 1884, page 714.2*

Right here we stop to notice an objection. A Presbyterian Catechism, which is before us, claims that the Sabbath is not the seventh day in order from the creation, but may be “any other

seventh part of our weekly time.” The reason it gives for this claim is this: “In the beginning of the commandment it is not said, ‘Remember the seventh day,’ but, ‘Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.’ Just so in the end of this command, the words are not, ‘The Lord blessed the seventh day,’ but, ‘The Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.’” The fallacy of this reasoning is very evident, when we remember that “*the seventh day is the Sabbath.*” Since the seventh day is the Sabbath, that is, the seventh day and the Sabbath exactly coincide, and are one and the same thing, a blessing pronounced on the Sabbath day was, of necessity, a blessing on the seventh day. But that there may be no chance for any to imagine that our reasoning is not sound, we quote the direct statement of the sacred record: “*And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified [hallowed, see Webster] it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.*” *Genesis 2:3*. In the face of this scripture, men may speculate as much as they please, but it will be in vain. It will still remain a fact that “the seventh day is the Sabbath.” *SITI November 27, 1884, page 714.3*

“But,” it is still objected, “the commandment does not say that the seventh day *of the week* is the Sabbath, and therefore we are left to decide for ourselves which seventh day we shall keep.” The inspired record desides this point, too. But first we would ask, If the commandment does not enjoin the observance of the seventh day *of the week*, what seventh day does it enjoin; it must be the seventh or last day of a period which consists of just seven days, the first six of which are devoted to labor. But the only period of that kind known is the week. Now turn to an incident recorded in the New Testament. *SITI November 27, 1884, page 714.4*

Immediately after the death of Jesus on the cross, Joseph of Arimathaea, begged his body, and took it down and laid it in a sepulcher. The inspired historian tells us “that day was the preparation, and the Sabbath drew on.” *Luke 23:54*. He says further that “the women also, which came with him to Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulcher, and how his body was laid. And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the Sabbath day.” *Verses 55, 56*. Here we have the record of two successive days,-the preparation day, and the Sabbath of rest, which immediately followed. What next? “Now upon *the first day of*

the week, very early in the morning, they came onto the sepulcher.” *Luke 24:1*. This was “when the Sabbath was past.” *Mark 16:1*. Now if the first day of the week immediately follows the Sabbath day, on what day of the week does the Sabbath come? The seventh, of course, for there are only seven days in a week. The disciples, then, rested on the seventh day of the week. But what does that signify? If you read the fifty-sixth verse entire, you will see. “And they returned, and prepared spices and appointments; and rested the Sabbath day *according to the commandment*.” We have already seen that they rested on the seventh day of the week; now if this was “according to the commandment,” what is plainer than that the fourth commandment enjoins the observance of the seventh day of *the week*? *SITI November 27, 1884, page 714.5*

We have learned, then, that the seventh day of the week was the Lord’s day from the beginning, that the Lord sanctified it, or made it holy, and that the followers of the Lord,-those who loved to honor him,-observed it as such even after the crucifixion. And here we will leave the subject for this week. E. J. W. *SITI November 27, 1884, page 714.6*

December 4, 1884

“The Sabbath-School” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 46.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST—DEC. 20

1. Where do you find the story of the rich man and Lazarus? *Luke 16:19-31.SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.1*
2. What description is given of the rich man? *Verse 19.SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.2*
3. What is said of Lazarus the beggar? *Verses 20, 21.SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.3*
4. What happened to them both? *Verse 22.SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.4*
5. Throughout the narrative, in what condition are they both represented as being? *Verses 30, 31.SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.5*
6. What further shows that they are not considered as being alive? *Verse 25.SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.6*
7. What is cited in the narrative as sufficient authority concerning the future? *Verses 29, 31.SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.7*
8. In the Old Testament, what do we learn as to the condition of the dead? *Ecclesiastes 9:5, 6.SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.8*
9. What becomes of their thoughts? *Psalms 146:3, 4.SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.9*
10. How much interest are they able to manifest in the affairs of their friends who still live? *Job 14:21.SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.10*
11. Where is the rich man represented as being after his death and

burial? But 16:22, 23. (See Revised Version.)*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.11*

12. What does the word “hell” (*hades*) signify? *1 Corinthians 15:55.* (See marginal reading of the word “grave.”)*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.12*

13. What have we learned as to the dominion of death and the grave over mankind? *Psalms 89:48.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.13*

14. To what place did Christ go when he died? *Acts 2:29-32.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.14*

15. What kind of a place is the grave? *Job 10:20-22.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.15*

16. What can you say concerning the activity of the wicked in the grave? *Psalms 31:17.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.16*

17. Why should people not put off that which they find to do in their life-time? *Ecclesiastes 9:10.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.17*

18. In view of this state of things, what kind of a land is the grave called? *Psalms 88:10-12.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.18*

19. In the narrative before us, where is the beggar represented as having been taken? *Luke 16:22.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.19*

20. What does the inspired record say of Abraham and his death? *Genesis 25:8.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.20*

21. Can this mean that he went to Heaven? *Joshua 24:2.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.21*

22. What is meant by “being gathered to his people”? *Genesis 15:15.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.22*

23. Was any different disposition made of Abraham than of the rich man in our lesson? Compare *Genesis 15:15; 25:9,* with *Luke 16:22.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.23*

24. Then must not all of these persons, if all of them ever really existed, have gone to the same place?*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.24*

25. What is the place to which all the dead go?*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.25*

LESSON FOR DECEMBER 27

1. Relate what is stated in the 16th of Luke concerning the rich man and the beggar.*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.26*

2. What happened to them both?*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.27*

3. To what place have we learned that they both went?*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.28*

4. Do you know of any people who are exempt from going into the grave?*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.29*

5. What does the psalmist say about all men going into the grave?*Psalm 89:48.SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.30*

6. Of what was “man” formed? *Genesis 2:7.SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.31*

7. What did he afterward become? *Ib.SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.32*

8. What was imparted to him to bring about this change? *Ib.SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.33*

9. Does the breath have life and consciousness in itself?*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.34*

10. How does the wise man describe the death of man?*Ecclesiastes 12:7.SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.35*

11. Since there is nothing to man but that which is formed of the dust, and the breath, can there be any conscious entity when the

dust returns to the earth?*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.36*

12. Give a brief summary of the Scripture statements concerning the dead-their place and condition.*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.37*

13. Since both Lazarus and the rich man are represented in *Luke 16* as dead, could the conversation ascribed to them have been real?*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.38*

14. What other instances can you cite of inanimate objects represented as talking? *Genesis 4:10; Habakkuk 2:10; James 5:4.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.39*

15. What are such representations called? See Webster's definition of "apologue."*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.40*

16. What important lesson is taught by this apologue?*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.41*

17. With what precious statement of Christ is it in harmony? *Luke 16:11-13.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.42*

18. What action of the Pharisees made its recital necessary? *Luke 16:14.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.43*

19. Why is human judgment as to the comparative worth of man liable to be at fault? *1 Samuel 16:7.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.44*

20. When will every man be judged according to his real merit? *1 Corinthians 4:5.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.45*

21. What will the righteous Judge give to those who love his appearing? *2 Timothy 4:8.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.46*

22. How will the despised, humble poor man stand then? *James 2:5.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.47*

23. When will the angels actually take the righteous to the mansions of rest? *Matthew 24:30, 31.**SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.48*

24. When will the wicked be tormented? *Matthew 13:40-42.SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.49*

25. When the separation is thus made, what fixes the gulf between the righteous and the wicked? *Revelation 22:11.SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.50*

That which forms the basis of these two lessons, is the story of the rich man and Lazarus, as found in *Luke 16:19-31*. It is given in the lesson under the general heading, "Immortality," although the Scripture has really nothing to do with that subject. The condition of the dead, or the final reward of the righteous and the wicked, was not the subject under consideration, and Christ did not design by this passage to teach anything concerning either of those things. The only object, then, in considering it as bearing on the subject of immortality, is to show what it does *not* teach, rather than what it does, and to make it the means of refreshing our minds on certain plain declarations of Scripture already learned.*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.51*

The idea that has become popular in regard to this passage of Scripture, is that a real occurrence is described—that the soul, or spirit, of Lazarus, and his death, was borne a way to a place called Abraham's bosom, in the full enjoyment of unutterable bliss, and that the disembodied soul, or spirit, of the rich man, as conscious as when it inhabited the body, was cast down to hell, there to suffer the torments of the damned. So firmly fixed is this idea in the minds of the majority of people, that it will be necessary to show its inconsistency before stating what the text is really designed to teach.*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.52*

Let us, then, for a moment suppose the passage to be a plain narration of fact. "And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom." *Verse 22*. The other is the law of language by which it can be made to appear that that which "was carried" is not the same thing that "died." Popular theory would have it that the *body* of Lazarus died, and that his *soul, or spirit*, was carried to Abraham's bosom. But the language forbids any such construction. "The beggar died and [the beggar] was carried." If only the body died, then only the body was carried;

if it was the soul or spirit that was carried, then it was only the soul or spirit that died. Let us suppose, by way of illustration, that a man is describing a hurricane and its effects. Of a certain building, he says: "The house trembled to its foundation, and was blown down." Now if, when you inquire the amount of the loss, he should say, "Oh, the house was not blown down, it was the people who were in it," would you not think that he needed to learn how to use the English language? So we think concerning those who would argue from this passage that one part of Lazarus died and another part was carried to Abraham's bosom.*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.53*

Again, we meet with the same difficulty in the case of the rich man. "The rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lift up his eyes." In this case the language plainly says that that which died was the same that was buried, and this again was the same that is next said to be in hell. If it was only the body that died and was buried, then it was only the body that was in torment. If it was the soul that was in torment, then was the soul that died. It will be noticed that throughout the narrative, all parties are represented as possessed of all the organs and faculties of ordinary living beings. These things are sufficient to show that the popular idea is inconsistent with itself, and that we cannot look upon this scripture as containing the relation of an natural occurrence.*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.54*

This conclusion is still further sustained by a consideration of the fact that both parties in this narrative are represented as dead. It is said of both that they died; Abraham says to the rich man, "Son, remember that thou in thy *life-time* receivedst thy goods things, and likewise Lazarus evil things, but *now* he is comforted, and thou art tormented." Here is a direct contrast between their present condition and their life-time. Now when we remember that "the dead know not anything," that when man's "breath goeth forth and he returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish;" that they perceive not when their friends are exalted or abased (*Job 14:21*), we conclude that this passage must partake of the nature of a fable.*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.55*

We find, moreover, that the word here translated "hell," is *hades*,

and this, we are told, is the Greek word signifying the place of all the dead. If we turn to *1 Corinthians 15:55*, we find that “hell” (*hades*) is placed in the margin as the equivalent of “grave” in the verse. Now in *Psalms 89:48* we learn that there are none who can deliver their souls from the power of the grave; and in harmony with this, we find that both righteous and wicked go there. *Genesis 37:35; Job 14:13; Psalm 31:17*. Still further, we find that this place where all go is a “land of forgetfulness” (*Psalms 88:10-12*); a “land of darkness, as darkness itself,” “where the light is as darkness” (*Job 10:22*); and that in it “there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom” (*Ecclesiastes 9:10*). Since all the dead go there, this narrative concerning those who are expressly declared to be dead, could not have been an actual occurrence. *SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.56*

This narrative may then properly be called a fable or an apologue. But the latter, Webster defines as “a story or relation of fictitious events, intended to convey useful truths; a moral fable.” It differs from a parable, in this respect: a parable relates things which do take place among mankind, and which therefore *might* occur in the case supposed; but an apologue relates the supposed actions and words of brutes and inanimate things. Of this figure of speech there are many instances in the Bible, as in *Genesis 4:10*, where Abel’s blood is said to cry; in *Habakkuk 2:11*, where the stone and the beam are said to speak together; in *James 5:4*, where the hire of the laborers is said to cry; and an extended instance occurs in *Judges 9:8-15*, where the trees are represented as talking among themselves, and choosing a king. In all of these cases, some truth is designed to be conveyed in a striking manner. *SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.57*

In order to understand what this fable is designed to teach, we must observe the connection. The chapter opens with the parable of the steward. He was commended because he prudently provided for the future. From this, the Saviour showed the necessity of using the wealth with which God may intrust us, in his service, so that he may commit to our trust true riches. Said he, “Ye cannot serve God and mammon.” “And the Pharisees also, who were covetous, heard all these things; and they derided him.” They regarded riches as a mark of God’s especial favor, and poverty as indicating his

displeasure. He therefore, by a fable drawn from their own tradition, showed that if a man has all his good things in this life, he can expect nothing more. He may *seem* to be far above his poverty-stricken but pious neighbor, but when things are seen as they really are, as God sees them, it will appear that there is indeed a great gulf between them, but that the advantage is all in favor of the poor man. Death ends the probation of every man, and thus *fixes* this gulf, so that there can be no changing of positions. E. J. W.*SITI December 4, 1884, page 726.58*

“The Salvation Army” The Signs of the Times, 10, 46.

E. J. Waggoner

Several weeks ago we copied from an editorial in the *Holiness Evangelist* a few sentences descriptive of an all-night meeting of the Salvation Army. The editor, although expressing a mild doubt as to the strict necessity for all their antics, was very enthusiastic in his praise of the meeting, telling how much good he had received, and advising everybody to attend the next one. One has just been held in San Jose, and a delegation of about seventy-five went down from Oakland. From the report of it in a paper published in Oakland, by members of the Salvation Army, we make the following extracts:-*SITI December 4, 1884, page 728.1*

“On the way down the drums and brass instruments, the tambourines, and the human lungs and voices were strained to their utmost. The psalmist, if he had been there, would have been reminded of his old days when men rejoiced before the Lord with all their might.”*SITI December 4, 1884, page 728.2*

If incoherent screeches, and a jargon of confused sounds constitute praise to God, then a minstrel show must be a very pious place, and a gang of hoodlums must be devout beyond all computation. Lest any should think that our comparisons are unjust, we quote from their own description of what took place after they reached the place of meeting in San Jose:-*SITI December 4, 1884, page 728.3*

“The Salvationists filled the platform full. Then commenced a meeting that is perfectly inconceivable to those who haven’t seen

it,-a meeting into which is brought into combination all the amusing features of a minstrel show, and the earnestness and solemnity of the day of Judgment. There was levity without license; unbounded fun, without a thought of sin in it; faces laughing in every feature with unmeasured glee, yet all radiant with the glory of God. Here was war in Heaven sure enough. Any one who has the idea that fighting sin is going to be a long-faced business had better go to an all-night meeting of the Salvation Army.”*SITI December 4, 1884, page 728.4*

That one of the participators could be serious and write stuff like the above, is sufficient evidence of the terrible delusion into which these people have fallen. To imagine that the solemnity of the Judgment can be associated with fun, levity, and the amusing features of a minstrel show, argues an amount of moral blindness that would be incomprehensible in professed Christians, were it not for certain texts of Scripture to be noticed hereafter. If any think that we publish such things for the purpose of holding them up to ridicule, they greatly mistake our purpose. It is too serious a matter for ridicule. We do it simply to call attention to the nature and tendency of the Salvation Army, and kindred organizations. We have held that the Salvation Army, and the so-called “Holiness Bands,” which are the same thing only less boisterous, are but feeders for Spiritualism; that they are, in fact, forms of Spiritualism; and that the leaders are simply in training, unconsciously, for Spiritualist mediums. Before we give a Scriptural reason for this judgment, we will present two or three paragraphs more, which may, perhaps, cause some to read with more interest and attention than which follows. In defending the statement that there is a Spiritualist gate to the heavenly city, the paper says:-*SITI December 4, 1884, page 728.5*

“Every Christian must see that Spiritualism has in it a great truth mixed with much error. This truth is the resurrection of the dead, but the Spiritualists are not out half far enough yet. This work cannot be complete till they can materialize the dead, and keep them materialized, so that they shall put on incorruption.”*SITI December 4, 1884, page 729.1*

Again, in another article we find this:-*SITI December 4, 1884, page*

“When God shall have prepared us, and when we ‘know Christ, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of the sufferings, being made conformable unto his death’ (*Philippians 3:10*), then shall we attain the resurrection of the dead, that is, we shall have power to call forth the dead, and, by virtue of the God power in us, assist them to put on incorruption.” *SITI December 4, 1884, page 729.3*

One specimen paragraph from an article, “The Vail Taken Away,” will suffice to show to what extent some who profess Christ, or even now given over to a “mind void of judgment:”-*SITI December 4, 1884, page 729.4*

“Through the past dispensation men have preached ‘Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness’ (*1 Corinthians 1:23*), but this stumbling block, this vail, is to be taken away.” *SITI December 4, 1884, page 729.5*

These extracts indicate the tendency of this movement. If it should be urged that no respectable number of people will ever accept such foolishness and error, we reply that there are tens of thousands of Spiritualists who seriously hold to error even worse than that which we have quoted. What is to hinder *all* members of the “Salvation Army” and the “Holiness Bands” from accepting the same and worse, even if they do not at present go to such great lengths? In their present attitude there is nothing to hinder it, but everything to favorite. Let us examine the guide book and see. In *Romans 1:28*, the apostle speaks of the heathen, whom God gave over to a “reprobate mind,” or, as the margin has it, to “a mind avoid of judgment.” The reason for this was “when they knew God they glorified him not as God,” and “did not like to retain God in their knowledge.” Again, in the *2 Timothy 3:8*, the same apostle speaks of others who are “of *no judgment* [margin] concerning the faith.” These are not heathen, but professing Christians, men who have “a form of godliness.” In their case, also, their lack of judgment concerning spiritual things, is due to the fact that, though they are “ever learning,” they are “never able to come to the knowledge of the truth,” and the reason for this is that they “*resist* the truth.” *SITI*

Such a condition of mind as this,-the individual being unable to judge correctly concerning the truth,-is the legitimate result of resisting it. The Saviour said: "Yet a little while is the light with you. Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you; for he that walketh in darkness *knoweth not whither he goeth.*" *John 12:35*. From this we can learn nothing else than that light will not remain with the person forever, unless used. "The path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day;" but if one rejects light, darkness comes, and then he will not know whither he goeth. "If the light that is in thee be darkness," said Jesus, "how great is that darkness." *Matthew 6:23*. The greater the light of man has, the greater will be the errors into which he will fall if he turns away from it. The case of Saul is an illustration of this. Called of God to rule over his people, and enjoying the favor of God, he rejected the word of the Lord, and was left to himself. The consequence was that he deliberately went for counsel to a woman who was in league with the devil, although he had previously strongly condemned all such practices. Numerous other instances might be cited to show how enlightened Christians may, by rejecting certain truth, fall to a condition where an outrageous sin will appear to them to be an act of righteousness. *SITI December 4, 1884, page 729.7*

Now how is it with these people? Do they exalt the law of God, and require their "converts" obedience to it? By no means. The law of God is the last thing thought of. The quotations made above show the looseness of their teaching. The "holiness" people, who are more conservative than their brethren of the "Salvation Army," also repudiate the law. Nearly three years ago a "holiness" paper published in this city, stated that one of the most effectual methods of checking the spread of holiness among the people was to "imbue them with the idea that they are to be holy by striving to do right, to keep the law of God." We have never seen this statement repudiated by any so-called "holiness" paper, and we have kept close watch of those published on this coast. It was only recently that the editor of the principal Pacific Coast "holiness" paper, and the leader of the movement in this city, when asked concerning the duty of man to obey the law of God, and keep his Sabbath said that

he had no patience with anybody that would ask such a question. Of course not. His mission is to spread “holiness,” and obedience to the law would checking it entirely. For our part we profess no sympathy with “holiness” that is opposed to God’s law, and we shall do all in our part to check it. *SITI December 4, 1884, page 729.8*

We have said that this movement leads directly into the follies and wickedness of Spiritualism. We repeat the statement. Give this thought careful attention: There is no intermediate ground between truth and error. Said Christ: “He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.” *Matthew 12:30*. If a man does not believe the truth, he must believe its opposite-error. But ever, owing to the natural deceitfulness of the human heart, rapidly propagates itself. As one falsehood leads to another, so one error accepted leads to the acceptance of another, and this, too many more. This is in harmony with the words of Christ, that if light be not accepted, darkness will come in its stead, and the unfortunate one will not know where he is going. By his own acts he places himself where he cannot control himself, and is led captive by Satan at his will. *SITI December 4, 1884, page 729.9*

The Bible, however, speaks plainly on this point. We read (2 *Thessalonians 2:9-12*) that just before the coming of the Lord, the devil will work among certain people with “all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness.” This indicates nothing less than complete satanic possession. How is it that Satan acquires such complete control them? “Because they received not the love of the truth.” “Strong delusion, that they should believe a lie,” is allowed to come upon all “who believe not the truth, but have pleasure in unrighteousness.” Now when we remember that the law of God alone is truth and righteousness (*Psalms 119:142, 151, 172, etc.*), and that these “holiness” people do not *profess* to believe it nor have pleasure therein, how can we doubt that they are opening the door for Satan to take possession, or, in other words, running into Spiritualism? As a matter of course, they all hold to that foundation doctrine of Spiritualism, natural immortality, or, the conscious existence of the dead. *SITI December 4, 1884, page 729.10*

We would not be understood as saying that all members of these

“bands” and “armies” have so fully rejected truth that they cannot be reclaimed. We only show a tendency of the movement. Many of them have never seen the light in its clearness; all such will have ample opportunity to accept it if they will. There is great danger, however, that these will become too infatuated to even see the light when it comes. They are educated to believe that feeling is faith, and that self-satisfaction is the evidence of the approbation of God.*SITI December 4, 1884, page 729.11*

We write in no spirit of harsh criticism. We pity the poor souls who are ensnared by this terrible delusion. But we feel that we would be recreant to duty if we did not sound a note of warning to those who may be looking upon the movement with favor. We make no apology for plain words concerning Spiritualism itself, and we know not why we should not be equally zealous in warning people against its advance guard. To all those not yet deluded, we would say, Give no countenance, either by word or by presence, to this counterfeit religion. You cannot afford, for the sake of gratifying your curiosity, to run the risk of falling under its power. Do not be misled by loud professions, and fervent prayers and exhortations, while the power of the “truth,” and even the profession of it, are wanting. Remember that the Lord has said: “To this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and *trembleth at my word.*” E. J. W.*SITI December 4, 1884, page 729.12*

“The Lord’s Day. (Continued.)” The Signs of the Times, 10, 46.

E. J. Waggoner

(Continued.)

From the Bible we have fully identified the Lord’s day. Following is a brief summary of the means by which it is done: The title Lord is applied to both Christ and the Father. Since these two are one, that which belongs to one must be the property of the other also; there can be no division between them. In *Isaiah 58:13* we learn that the Lord’s day is holy, and that it is the Sabbath; and this at once caused us to turn to the fourth commandment, where we found that the seventh day is declared to be the Sabbath. Since the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord (*Exodus 20:10*), and the Sabbath is

the Lord's holy day (*Exodus 20:10, 11; Isaiah 58:13*), it necessarily follows that the seventh day is the Lord's day. Lest any one should think that this is not definite enough, we have it stated that the women who rested on the "Sabbath day, according to the commandment" (*Luke 23:56*), did so upon the day before the first day of the week, or in other words, upon the *seventh day of the week*. In the naming of the days of the week, the name "Saturday" was given to the seventh day (see Webster's Dictionary, Cyclopedias, etc.), and since the names are now used more frequently than the numerals, it may be more clear if we say that from the Bible we find that the day now called Saturday is the Lord's day. So confident are we of the correctness of our deductions that we defy anybody to show from the Bible that any other day than Saturday is entitled to the designation "Lord's day." *SITI December 4, 1884, page 729.13*

Although the fact that the seventh day-Saturday-is the true Lord's day has been established, we will carry our investigation further, and show that there is no chance for even the supposition that any other day was elevated to the position of Lord's day. In the second chapter of Mark, we find that on a certain occasion the Pharisees reproved Christ for allowing his disciples to satisfy their hunger on the Sabbath day, by eating the wheat which they plucked as they walked through the field. It will not be disputed that the day here called "the Sabbath day" was the seventh day of the week,-Saturday,-because it was the day which the Pharisees recognized as the Sabbath. Let this be borne in mind while you read the words of Christ, "Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." *Mark 2:28*. In the face of this, can anyone deny that the seventh-day Sabbath is the Lord's day? The fourth commandment plainly declares that it is so, and Christ has added his testimony to the same effect. *SITI December 4, 1884, page 729.14*

It is sometimes claimed that the text last quoted, "The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath," shows that, as Lord of the Sabbath, Christ had the authority to do with it as he pleased, even to changing it, or dispensing with it entirely. We will not discuss the question of his right or power; the only question that can affect the case is, Did he, as Lord of the Sabbath, violate it, or give any individuals license to do so? He did not, as we shall see; then, of

course, his being Lord of the Sabbath day, does not alter our relation to it. He was its Lord from the beginning, and we cannot show our allegiance to him as our Lord, without honoring the day which he especially claims as his own. We will now examine some texts to show how Jesus regarded the Sabbath day. *SITI December 4, 1884, page 730.1*

In *Luke 4:16* we read as follows concerning an act of Christ very soon, after his baptism: "And he came to Nazareth, where he was brought up; and as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read." Webster's definition of the word "custom" is this: "Frequent repetition of the same act; way of acting; ordinary manner; habitual practice; usage." So we learn that it was his habitual practice to observe the seventh-day Sabbath as a day of public worship. This is in perfect harmony with his declaration in *John 15:10*: "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love." If he kept his Father's commandments, He must have kept the fourth commandment, which enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week; and so we learn from Christ's own statement, made the very night of his betrayal, that he had always kept the Sabbath. *SITI December 4, 1884, page 730.2*

John 5:18 is sometimes quoted as proof that Christ did not regard the Sabbath as sacred. His own testimony should certainly be taken in preference to that of the Pharisees. They said that he had broken the Sabbath; he said, some time after the events recorded in *John 5*, "I have kept my Father's commandments." We must believe, then, that he did not break the Sabbath. It is true he went directly contrary to some of the Rabbinical traditions, but that amounts to nothing. Had he followed their traditions, he could not have kept the law, for by their traditions they transgressed the law. *Matthew 5:3. SITI December 4, 1884, page 730.3*

What had Jesus done that the Pharisees accused him of Sabbath-breaking? He had on the Sabbath day healed a man of an infirmity of thirty-eight years' standing, and had told him to take up to little mat upon which he was lying, and walk. *John 5:1-9*. Now was this a good act? Most certainly it was. Well, Jesus himself declared, on another and similar occasion, that "it is lawful to do well on the

Sabbath days." *Matthew 12:12*. He is the Lord of the Sabbath, and, as such, was competent to declare the law of the Sabbath. The charge that Jesus broke the Sabbath comes now, as it did then, from a narrow and mistaken idea of the Sabbath commandment. He said that his act was lawful, and so it was, but the fourth commandment forbids only *our own*, or secular work. Work that is done in the service of God, as was that performed by the priests in the sanctuary, work that does not in any way benefit the worker, but is solely for the glory of God, is not forbidden by the commandment. Thus the Saviour is vindicated from the charge of Sabbath-breaking. How serious a charge this is, and how blindly wicked are those who make it, will be shown next week. E. J. W.*SITI*
December 4, 1884, page 730.4

December 11, 1884

“Ancient Spiritualism. Saul and the Witch” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 47.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST-JAN. 3. Ancient Spiritualism.

SAUL AND THE WITCH

1. When on a certain occasion the Philistine host came against Israel, how was King Saul affected? *1 Samuel 28:4, 5.SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.1*
2. To whom did he seek for guidance? *Verses 7, 8.SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.2*
3. How had Saul previously treated such people? *Verses 3, 9.SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.3*
4. By what authority had he done so? *Exodus 22:18; Leviticus 20:27.SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.4*
5. Why had the Lord given such instruction concerning the diviners, consultants of familiar spirits, etc.? *Deuteronomy 18:10-12.SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.5*
6. With what people were such abominations common? *Verses 9, 12.SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.6*
7. What had the Lord said it would be the result to those who should seek after such persons? *Leviticus 19:31.SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.7*
8. Since Saul had obeyed the Lord in putting away those who had familiar spirits, why did he now consult one? *1 Samuel 28:6.SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.8*
9. When he went, for whom did he ask? *Verse 11.SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.9*

10. Why did he not go directly to Samuel? *Verse 3.SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.10*

11. What can you say concerning the part which the dead are able to act in earthly affairs? *Ecclesiastes 9:5, 6.SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.11*

12. Give other Scripture testimony concerning the state of the dead.*SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.12*

13. Then could it indeed have been Samuel himself who carried on the subsequent conversation with Saul?*SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.13*

14. Was Saul at this time in favor with the Lord? *1 Samuel 28:6.SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.14*

15. Why had the Lord rejected Saul? *1 Samuel 15:22, 23.SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.15*

16. When people reject the word of the Lord, what are they left to believe? *2 Thessalonians 2:11, 12.SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.16*

17.Then since Saul had rejected the word of the Lord, what must his supposed interview with Samuel have been?*SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.17*

18. Who is the author of the illusions and lies? *John 8:44.SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.18*

19. Whom did he then worship? *1 Corinthians 10:20.SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.19*

20. When the Israelites turned from the Lord, whom did they worship? *Deuteronomy 32:16, 17.SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.20*

21. Then what sort of a spirit was it which Saul consulted?*SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.21*

22. How is the devil able to make himself appear? *2 Corinthians*

11:14.*SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.22*

23. If he can appear as an angel light, would it not be easy for him to assume the appearance of persons who have died?*SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.23*

24. How could Saul hath kept from being deceived?*SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.24*

The lesson this week is based on the account of Saul's visit to the witch of Endor, recorded in the *1 Samuel 28*. In order to keep the connection, the entire chapter should be carefully read. It may not be amiss to say that many good people suppose that Samuel did really come and talk with Saul, and thus they are strengthened in their belief of the conscious existence of the dead. We shall follow the subject in the order of the questions in the lesson, and see what we find.*SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.25*

The scene opens with the Philistine host prepared to fight against the Israelites. So great was the number of the Philistines, as compared with that of the Israelites, that Saul was very much alarmed. As it is forcibly expressed in the text, "his heart greatly trembled." When David was surrounded by enemies, he said to the Lord, in his prayer, "What time I am afraid, I will trust in thee;" but Saul was in a pitiable condition, for when he would seek the Lord, he received no answer. In his extremity he had his servants find a woman that had a familiar spirit, and, disguising himself, he went to her for information.*SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.26*

It was necessary for him to disguise himself, else he could not have gained admittance to the witch's abode; for in time past, "Saul had put away those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, out of the land." This was in accordance with the command of God, and does not mean simply banishment, but death. Thus: "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." *Exodus 22:18*. "A man also or woman that hath a familiar spirit, or that is a wizard shall surely be put to death." *Leviticus 20:27*. In *Deuteronomy 18:9-12* we learn that witchcraft, and consulting with familiar spirits, was very common among the heathen that inhabited Canaan and before it was conquered by the Israelites. Under direction from the Lord, Moses said to Israel: "When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth

thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations. There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord; and because of these abominations the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee.” The woman at Endor was one who had, by some means, escaped the proscription.*SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.27*

In order to a perfect understanding of this incident, it is very necessary to know the relation that existed between Saul and the Lord. Why would not the Lord listen to Saul? The answer is founded *1 Samuel 15*. The Lord had given Saul a commission, and he had not fulfilled it. He deliberately disobeyed the Lord. And this was only one of a long series of disobedient acts. So the prophet Samuel announced the will of the Lord, in these words: “For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath also rejected thee from being king.” *1 Samuel 15:23*. From that time, we learn that Samuel came no more to see Saul. So we see that Saul’s rejection by the Lord was due to the fact that he himself had first rejected the Lord.*SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.28*

When Saul came to the witch, he said, “Bring me up Samuel.” Why did he not seek directly to the prophet himself? Because “Samuel was dead, and all Israel had lamented him, and buried him in Ramah, even in his own city.” *1 Samuel 28:3*. In response to this request the woman told him that she saw an old man, covered with a mantle, coming up out of the earth. *Verses 13, 14*. The reader will notice that in this case Saul did not seek the apparition at all, but “perceived that it was Samuel,” from the woman’s description. Notice, also, that the pious Samuel was called “up,” and came up “out of the earth,” instead of down from heaven. Saul knew nothing about the doctrine of the good going to Heaven at death, and the heathen, one of whom he was consulting, it had all souls, good and bad alike, in the lower world-in *hades*.*SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.29*

Now what reasons have we for saying that Samuel did not converse with Saul on that occasion, and was not there at all? 1. It is not reasonable to suppose that, if Samuel would not during his life-time listen to Saul, whom he loved, when personally urged do so, he would come to him after death, at the solicitation of a despised heathen. 2. It is the height of absurdity to suppose that God, who had rejected Saul, and had refused to answer him in his own appointed way,-by dreams, by Urim, or by prophets,-would communicate with him through one whom he had said should be put to death as an abominable thing. 3. That which settles the matter beyond all controversy, is the word of inspiration: "The living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything." "Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished." "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." *Ecclesiastes 9:5, 6, 10*. Man's "breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." *Psalms 146:4*. Satan has the power of *death*; but the Lord alone has *life*. Satan can seize men, and shut them up in his prison house, the grave; but Satan cannot liberate them; Christ alone has the keys of the grave; he alone can set Satan's captives free. For these reasons, we say we *know* that Samuel had no more to do with the occurrence narrated in *1 Samuel 28*, than the stones under their feet. *SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.30*

"If Samuel was not there, who personated him so successfully as to deceive Saul?" Satan, or one of his evil angels. And this also is susceptible of Bible proof. First, we learn that "Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light." *2 Corinthians 11:14*. It was as an angel light, his true form and character concealed, that he came with his temptations to Christ in the wilderness. Had he come as the chief of the powers of darkness, he could not have hoped to make any impression on the Saviour. He hoped to deceive Jesus into thinking that he was an angel sent with a message from heaven. The Lord, however, saw through the disguise at once. But the point is, if Satan may appear as an angel light, how much more may he not personate a human being. To successfully personate another is nothing more than many *man* are able to do. *SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.31*

Second, Saul had put himself on the devil's ground. Long before he had first cast off, and then been cast off by the Lord. Now there is no neutral ground between the Lord and Satan. As soon as Saul was entirely out from under the influence of God, he passed under the influence of Satan. His frenzied attacks on the innocent David showed the influence under which he had fallen. Then what more natural than that he, being under the influence of the devil, should go to the devil for help? A "familiar spirit" is "a demon or evil spirit supposed to attend the call."-*Webster*. "Witchcraft" is "intercourse with evil spirits." See also the definition of "sorcery," and "enchantment." This was what the heathen practiced. Their worship was devil worship. "But I say, that the things which the Gentile sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils." *1 Corinthians 10:20*. Whenever the Israelites forsook the Lord, they engaged in devil worship. See *Deuteronomy 32:16, 17; Psalm 106:34-37*. No wonder that they were an abomination to the Lord. Therefore, since Saul had voluntarily put himself under the devil's power, we are forced to conclude that the devil deceived him in this instance. Deceived him, indeed he did; for if space permitted, we could show that Saul did not die on the morrow, as was intimated to him. *SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.32*

"How could Saul have kept from being deceived?" By heeding the word of the Lord. "Strong delusion, that they should believe a lie" (*2 Thessalonians 2:9-12*), is not sent to men until they reject the truth. And in that case, how could it be otherwise? If a man does not believe the truth, what is there but lies for him to believe? Remember, also, that it is an "evil heart of unbelief" that first leads men away from God, and under the devil's power. And now we will give a sure rule for detecting all evil spirits. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." *Isaiah 8:20*. Christ at once detected Satan's attempted imposture because he acted contrary to the written word. So when we hear of men who pretend to communicate with the dead, we may know that there is no light in them, because the Bible says "the dead know not anything." If we strictly adhere to God's word, we cannot be deceived; if we cast any portion of it aside, we need not hope to stand. E. J. W. *SITI December 11, 1884, page 742.33*

E. J. Waggoner

(Continued.)

At the close of our article last week, we were considering the charge made against Christ, that he violated the Sabbath. Those who make this charge are doubtless not aware of its real import, and we will therefore show them. The Sabbath commandment is one of the ten precepts of the law of God. It enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week. Whoever breaks that commandment is guilty of sin, “or sin is the transgression of law.” *1 John 3:4*. To say, therefore, that Jesus broke the fourth, or any other of the ten commandments, is equivalent to saying that he was a sinner. It is hardly necessary to quote Peter’s assertion that he “did no sin,” for we do not know of any one that would claim in a direct manner that he did; but it is no worse to say openly that Jesus was a sinner, than it is to charge him with the violation of one of the commandments. *SITI December 11, 1884, page 744.1*

Read once more Christ’s words in *John 15:10*: “If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father’s commandments, and abide in his love.” From this we understand that those who do not keep his commandments cannot abide in his love; and the idea which he conveys is that his abiding in his Father’s love was due to the observance of his commandments. It will be said that it is impossible to conceive of such a thing as that Christ should not abide in the Father’s love; this is love, and the reason is that it is impossible to conceive that Christ should in any degree deviate from the will of a Father. See *John 6:38*. *SITI December 11, 1884, page 744.2*

The words of Christ, in *Matthew 5:17, 18*, while they vindicate him from the charge of commandment-breaking, establish most firmly our conclusion that the seventh day-Saturday-is still the Lord’s day. Remembering that the fourth commandment of the law enjoins the observance of the seventh day, declaring that it is the Lord’s holy day, we read: “Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto

you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." As Christ said on another occasion, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of the law to fail." *Luke 16:17*. There is no possibility of mistaking these words. While heaven and earth endure, the law of God cannot be changed to the extent of the mutilation of a single letter. Then the seventh day must be the Lord's day as long as heaven and earth remain. *SITI December 11, 1884, page 744.3*

Lest some one should cavil at *John 15:10*, and say that we are now to keep the commandments of Christ, and not those of the Father, we repeat that since Christ and the Father are one, their commandments must be the same. Jesus himself answered this objection in advance, not only in *Matthew 5:17-19*, but in *John 6:38*: "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me;" and also in *John 7:16*: "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." Thus we have again proved that the seventh day is now the Lord's day, and must remain so until the end of the time. *SITI December 11, 1884, page 744.4*

We now turn once more to trace its course through the New Testament. In the 24th of Matthew we have an instance of Christ's tender regard for his own sacred day. In telling his disciples of the future destruction of Jerusalem, he warned them that when they should see Jerusalem compassed with armies they should flee from the city, and from all Judea. "But pray ye," said he, "that your flight be not in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day." *Verse 20*. On this verse Olshausen says: "In interpreting this it must be observed that Jesus regards the law of the Sabbath as divine, and part of the moral law, yet without sanctioning the rigid notions which prevailed among the Jews concerning the Sabbath law as correct." Here, again, there can be no doubt that the day to which Christ referred was the seventh day of the week-the day which the Jews kept as the Sabbath. So, then, he recognized the fact that the seventh day would be the Sabbath forty years after his ascension. *SITI December 11, 1884, page 744.5*

After the ascension of Christ, when the disciples were about their work of preaching the gospel, we find frequent mention of the Sabbath. Thus Paul and his companions went out of Philippi on the

Sabbath to a place of prayer by the river-side, and he spoke to those who assembled there. *Acts 16:13*. At Antioch, in Pisidia, they “went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and sat down.” *Acts 13:14*. After Paul had concluded his discourse, and the Jews had gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles “besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath.” “And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God.” *Acts 13:42, 44*. Again, at Thessalonica, where there was a synagogue of the Jews, “Paul, *as his manner was*, went in unto them, and *three Sabbath days* reasoned with them out of the Scriptures.” *Acts 17:2*. When Paul arrived in Corinth, he made his home with a Jewish family, “And he reasoned in the synagogue *every Sabbath*, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks.” *Acts 18:4*. This practice was kept up as long as he remained there, a year and six months, at least. *Verse 11. SITI December 11, 1884, page 745.1*

These texts show the custom of Paul and his companions, but it is not for that purpose that we quote them. We do not plead “apostolic example” in behalf of Sabbath observance or any other good act. That is to say, we do not keep the Sabbath *because* the apostles did. We know that they did keep the Sabbath, for the same reason that they refrained from worshipping idols, and from theft, because they had regard to regard to the law of God, which enjoins the first act, and prohibits the others, and we do the same for the same reason. Our object in quoting these references to “the Sabbath day,” is to call attention to the use of that term in the New Testament. There can be no question but that in every one of these instances the seventh day is referred to. Now the New Testament, as well as the old, was written by inspiration of God. That is, the Holy Ghost was really the author of the instruction there given. We find, then, that the Holy Ghost calls the seventh day of the week “the Sabbath day,” just the same as when the Old Testament was written. The New Testament was written by Christians and for Christians; and whatever name it uses to designate anything, must be the proper term for Christians to use, and the *only* proper term. Therefore the proper appellation for the seventh day of the week is “Sabbath,” or “Lord’s day,” for both refer to the same thing. *SITI December 11, 1884, page 745.2*

One point more. The New Testament does not recognize any day as the Sabbath, except the seventh day. This may easily be shown. James, in addressing the council at Jerusalem, said: "For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues *every Sabbath day.*" *Acts 15:21.* And Paul, in his discourse at Antioch said: "For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets *which are read every Sabbath day.*" *Acts 13:27.* Paul and James are both speaking of Jewish worshipers. No one questions the fact that it was conducted on the seventh day of the week, and no one would make the claim that it was ever conducted, excepting occasionally an annual festival, on the first day of the week. Therefore when those inspired apostles said that Moses and the prophets were read in the Jewish synagogue "every Sabbath day," they most effectively restricted the use of the term "Sabbath" to the seventh day of the week. If something that is read on every successive seventh day, is read on "every Sabbath," there is certainly no possibility that any other day of the week can be the Sabbath. But the Lord says that the Sabbath is his holy day; therefore every seventh day of the week,-every Saturday, if you please,-is a "Lord's day." This statement is made without the slightest fear of successful contradiction. E. J. W.*SITI December 11, 1884, page 745.3*

"Who Is Responsible?" The Signs of the Times, 10, 47.

E. J. Waggoner

The first number of the *Western Churchman*, a neat, well-printed eight-page paper, published in Denver, Col., has just come to our table. As its name indicates, it is devoted to the interests of the Episcopal Church in the West. We wish it well, and have no doubt that it will succeed. That which the most attracted our attention, however, was something not peculiar to the journal, but an extract from the catechism. In the Sunday-school lesson occurs the following:-*SITI December 11, 1884, page 745.4*

"Q.-What did your Sponsors then for you?*SITI December 11, 1884, page 745.5*

“A.-They did promise and vow three things in my name:*SITI December 11, 1884, page 745.6*

“First-That I should renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh. Secondly-That I should believe all the articles of the Christian faith. And thirdly-That I should keep God’s holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of my life.”*SITI December 11, 1884, page 745.7*

This, our readers will understand, is the promise that is made at the baptism (sprinkling) of an infant. As we read it, the thought occurred to us that those who make it take a grave responsibility upon themselves. We do not believe that any realize how great it is. Let us see. The baptism of an individual indicates his death to sin, and his determination to walk, as the apostle says, “in newness of life;” or, as the catechism has it, to “renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh,” and “keep God’s holy will and commandments, and walk in the same,” all the days of his life. Now it is evident that an infant a few days or weeks, or even months old, is not competent to make any such promise. It knows nothing of the sinful works of the flesh, nor of God’s holy will and commandments. This is well understood and therefore his parents, or some other persons of mature age, make a promise for him. These persons are then called that child’s sponsors.*SITI December 11, 1884, page 745.8*

The question now arises, Suppose that the child, as he approaches manhood, does not manifest any disposition to fulfill the vow made for him by his sponsors, who is responsible? Such a case frequently happens. We have personally known many who have been baptized (?) in infancy, who courted “the pomps and vanities of this wicked world,” and revealed in “all the sinful lusts of the flesh.” It is barely possible that they nominally believed the “articles of the Christian faith;” but their faith was not indicated by works, for they lived and died in open violation of “God’s holy will and commandments.” Now in such cases are not those who made the vow responsible for its non-fulfillment? The very name that is applied to them-“sponsors”-indicates that they are.*SITI December 11, 1884, page 745.9*

A sponsor, according to Webster, is “one who binds himself to answer for another, and is responsible for his default.” Then those who make the vow above recorded virtually say, “I bind myself as surety that this vow shall be fulfilled in the future life of this infant; if he shall fail to fulfill it, I will do it myself, or will suffer the consequences of such failure.” But this, as all can see, involves difficulties that cannot be overcome. *SITI December 11, 1884, page 745.10*

1. It becomes necessary, in case the child approves faithless, for the sponsor to do his duty for him, as well as his own. This, however, is an impossibility, for no man can do more than his own duty. It is upon the supposition that a man may do more than his own duty that the Catholics base the monstrous doctrine of indulgences. Christ says: “When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do.” *Luke 17:10. SITI December 11, 1884, page 745.11*

2. “The wages of sin is death;” and since the child lives and dies in sin, the one who has pledged himself to become responsible for his failure to live a Christian life, must die in his stead. But here more difficulties present themselves. (a) What is to become of the one in whose stead the sponsor dies? He cannot be saved, for he has never accepted Christ, and “there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.” *Acts 4:12*. Then to men must die for the offense of only one. This would be injustice, and therefore cannot be, for God is just. (b) The sponsor has, no doubt, lived a life of humble obedience, and faith in Christ; then according to the promise (*Romans 10:9; Revelation 22:14*), he must be saved. And thus it happens that he must both live and die! His own reward is eternal life, but on account of the sins of the one for whom he became surety, he must suffer eternal death. Impossible. *SITI December 11, 1884, page 745.12*

3. While there can be no doubt that the sponsor really pledges himself to one or the other of the above-mentioned impossible things, the Bible settles the matter thus: “Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the soul that sinneth, it shall die.” “The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The

son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him.” *Ezekiel 18:4, 20.SITI December 11, 1884, page 745.13*

Thus we see that in no way is it possible for sponsors to fulfill the vow that they make at the so-called baptism of an infant. Their action is nothing else than a solemn farce. But does this relieve them entirely from responsibility? By no means. It is not a light thing for one to promise that which he can by no possibility fulfill. If for “every idle word that man shall speak they shall give account thereof in the day of Judgment,” how much more shall they be held to answer if those idle words are in the form of solemn vows.*SITI December 11, 1884, page 745.14*

The conclusion which any one can see should be drawn is that such promises are sinful. God never requires men to make promises that involves such contradictions, and that cannot be fulfilled. “But the child cannot promise for himself to forsake the ways of sin, and what shall be done?” Wait until he is able to make his own choice. If the child is not old enough to make an intelligent choice for himself, he cannot know what sin is, and therefore needs no baptism. “But the Saviour says, ‘Suffer little children to come unto me,’ and how dare we disobey that command?” You need not. “Suffer,” that is, allow them to come. Do not throw any obstacle in their way, and you will be obeying it. You may invite them to come, you may urge them to come; but do not think that you can come in their stead. The most that you can do in that line is to set a godly example for them; if this is done, they will undoubtedly come.*SITI December 11, 1884, page 745.15*

These remarks apply to all who practice what is called infant baptism. The inconsistencies herein shown up, should convince them of the folly of such a practice. We have not begun to enumerate the evils that grow out of it; their name is legion. For all of these, we ask, Who is responsible? With what words will those who practice infant baptism answer, when the Judge shall ask, “Who hath required this at your hands?” E. J. W.*SITI December 11, 1884, page 745.16*

December 18, 1884

“The Sabbath-School. Spiritualism” *The Signs of the Times*, 10, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

LESSON FOR THE PACIFIC COAST-JAN. 10. Spiritualism.

1. What did Paul say should come in the last days? *2 Timothy 3:1.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.1*
2. What causes these perilous times? *Verses 2-5.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.2*
3. What sort of persons are they who do these things? *Verse 6.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.3*
4. What all-important requirement do they lack? *Verse 7.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.4*
5. How do they resist the truth? *Verse 8.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.5*
6. How was it that the magicians of Egypt withstood Moses? *Exodus 7:10-12.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.6*
7. For what purpose will miracles be performed just before the Lord's coming? *Matthew 24:23, 24.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.7*
8. By what power did the heathen magicians perform their miracles? *1 Corinthians 10:20.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.8*
9. Then must we not expect, from the words of Paul and Christ, that by the aid of devils, miracles will be performed in the last days? *Revelation 16:13, 14.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.9*
10. For what purpose do these spirits of devils work miracles? *Ib.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.10*

11. What immediately follows their deceitful miracles? *Verse 15.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.11*
12. What did Paul say the coming of Christ would immediately follow? *2 Thessalonians 2:8, 9.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.12*
13. Among other things what do these wonder-working spirits profess to be? *Matthew 24:23, 24.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.13*
14. What is the specific work of Christ? *John 5:40; 10:10.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.14*
15. What has Christ brought to light? *2 Timothy 1:10.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.15*
16. Then if the spirits claim to be Christ, what will they claim to have demonstrated?*SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.16*
17. By what is this now fulfilled?*SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.17*
18. Who originated the doctrine of the natural immortality of man? *Genesis 3:4.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.18*
19. Who is this serpent? *Revelation 20:2.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.19*
20. What effect does this doctrine have upon the wicked? *Ezekiel 13:22.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.20*
21. How is it that people are deceived by these lies? *2 Thessalonians 2:9-12.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.21*
22. When we are urged to seek unto them that have familiar spirits, to what should we turn? *Isaiah 8:19, 20.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.22*
23. How is it that we can resist the adversary? *1 Peter 5:8, 9.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.23*

24. In order to successfully resist the devil, where must we have the word of God? *Psalm 119:11.SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.24*

“This know also, that in the last days perilous time shall come.” Reference is here made to the time immediately preceding the coming of the Lord. The reason why the times are then so perilous, is contained in the first clause of the second verse: “For men shall be lovers of their own selves.” The sins that are afterward enumerated are simply different forms of the one great sin-supreme love for self; men will love themselves, and pleasures, more than they love God. There is no form of idolatry that is any more debasing than this.*SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.25*

“Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof.” Those who commit these crimes are professed followers of God. Here, then, we find that there are heathen who have a knowledge of the true God, and who profess to worship him. The sins that are imputed to them are of the same class exactly as those which are common among the ancient heathen. See *Romans 1:28-32*. How is it that they deny the power of godliness? By their evil practices. Paul elsewhere speaks of certain unbelieving ones, who “profess that they know God, but in works they deny him.” *Titus 1:16*. The apostle does not say that these persons have no power; but it is the power of *godliness* that they lack. They are of the class that the prophet speaks of, who take delight in approaching to God, who fast, and afflict themselves, and are very fervent in their devotions, yet the Lord sees them not. These are they of whom the Lord speaks in *Matthew 7:22*: “Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?” Surely, such zeal and power must indicate true Christianity; but the Saviour says he will say to them, “I never knew you.” They will be told to depart from him. Why? Because, with all their profession, they “work iniquity,” or do unlawful deeds.*SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.26*

One sin seems to especially characterize this class. Not content with saying that they are “without natural affection” and “incontinent,” the apostle continues. “For of this sort are they which creep into houses, and lead captive silly women, laden with sins,

led away with divers lusts.” From the fact that they are “ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth,” we conclude that these people do not regard their wicked practices as sinful. They have not that “knowledge of the truth” which would enlighten them, and so they “call evil good, and good evil.” They are “despisers of those that are good,” and in their blindness they “resist the truth.” *SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.27*

How do they resist the truth? “As Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these resist the truth.” *2 Timothy 3:8*. This sheds a flood of light on the subject, for in *Exodus 7:11*, and onward, we learn that Pharaoh’s magicians withstood Moses “with their enchantments.” They withstood him by performing, up to a certain point, miracles, the object of which was to make the king believe that his gods were as powerful as the God of Israel. Enchantment is the same as sorcery, and witchcraft; it is “intercourse with evil spirits.” Then the magicians, Paul tells us were Jannes and Jambres, resisted Moses by means of their intercourse with evil spirits. What evil spirits? The spirits of devils, for heathen worship was nothing but devil worship; when the heathen offered sacrifices, they offered them to devils. *1 Corinthians 10:20*. Now since people in the last days will resist the truth just as the magicians did, we know that they will oppose the spread of the truth by means of miracles which, through the power of Satan, they are unable to perform. *SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.28*

This conclusion is verified still further by the prophet, who saw, just before the coming of the Lord, the “spirits of devils working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world.” *Revelation 16:14, 15*. Paul also tells us that the coming of Christ follows “the working of Satan with all power and signs and wonders.” *2 Thessalonians 2:9*. Christ spoke of these wonders as being signs of his coming, and said that they would be so great that, if it were possible, they would deceive the very elect. *Matthew 24:23, 24*. These verses also give us a clue to the nature of these deceptions. “For there shall arise false christs, and false prophets.” Now if certain people profess to be Christ, they must necessarily profess to do the work which the Bible says Christ alone has power to do. Christ says, “I am come that they might have life.” Paul says that Christ has “brought life and immortality to light through the

gospel.” Modern Spiritualists claim that Spiritualism alone demonstrates the immortality of the soul. They say that while Christians *believe* that man is immortal, they *prove* it. By their so-called materialization of dead persons, they *seem* to prove it, but this is the delusion against which we are warned. *SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.29*

Satan’s first recorded lie, the one which has formed the basis of all his deceptions, was the statement to Eve, “Ye shall not surely die.” There in the garden of Eden he proclaimed the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. By this same doctrine he deceives the people in the last days. The great truth of the Bible is salvation in Christ alone; salvation from sin and its penalty, death; “He that believeth on the Son have everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life.” *John 3:36*. Those who do not receive this true, who teach that there will be endless life for the wicked, and that the dead are not really dead, are open to this deception of Satan. The devils, personating individuals who have died, can appear to their friends who believe in the immortality of the soul, and thus “demonstrate” it to them. When people accept this as truth, the miracles which they perform will also be attributed to the Spirit of God. Then those who say anything against the doctrines taught by these wonder-working spirits, will be accused of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, and will be persecuted. Thus these last-day apostates become “despisers of those that are good.” *SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.30*

The only safety is in having the word of God *hidden* in the heart. If the word has been “engrafted” into life of the individual, he will always have wherewith to resist the devil. “And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead? To the law and to the [the Spirit of prophecy; see *Revelation 19:10*] if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.” *Isaiah 8:19, 20*. E. J. W. *SITI December 18, 1884, page 758.31*

“The Lord’s Day. (Concluded.)” The Signs of the Times, 10, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

(Concluded.)

It would seem that the many Bible proofs that the seventh day of the week is “the Lord’s day” should be sufficient to silence all cavil among those who claim to regard the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice. But some will say, “You have entirely ignored the claims of the first day of the week; if you examine the record concerning that day, you might find cause to change your mind.” We do not believe that we should; for when a thing is positively proved to be right, its opposite is, by the same argument, just as surely shown to be wrong. If the seventh day is “the Lord’s day,” then the first day cannot be. But in order that there may be no dissatisfaction, we will see what the Bible has to say about the first day. With the aid of a concordance we can easily find every text in the New Testament, which contains reference to the first day of the week. *SITI December 18, 1884, page 760.1*

The first text is *Matthew 28:1*: “In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulcher.” Simply an incidental mention of the day, so we will go on. *SITI December 18, 1884, page 760.2*

Mark 16:1, 2: “And when the Sabbath was passed Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him [Jesus]. And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came under the sepulcher at the rising of the sun.” This is but a repetition of what we found in the other texts. One point, however, we would call attention to. The Sabbath is the Lord’s day, as we have proved at length. See *Isaiah 58:13*. Now the first day of the week did not come until after the Sabbath was passed; therefore these texts, instead of showing the first day to be the Lord’s day, prove positively that it is not. But we will look further. *SITI December 18, 1884, page 760.3*

Luke 24:1: “Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they [the women, see *chap. 23:55*] came unto the sepulcher, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them.” Here again the evidence is damaging to the

claims of Sunday to be the Lord's day. First, we notice that the disciples took the first day of the week to do a work of love for Jesus, which they would not do on the day of his crucifixion, because "the Sabbath drew on." Second, we find (*chap. 23:54-56*) that that Sabbath day immediately preceded the first day, and that they rested upon it "according to the commandment." That says "the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord" (*Exodus 20:10*); showing that the first day is not the Lord's day. We will try again. *SITI December 18, 1884, page 760.4*

John 20:1: "The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulcher, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulcher." Simply a reiteration of the statement that on the first day of the week certain Christian women set out to perform a piece of work. We must evidently look elsewhere for our Sunday Lord's day. *SITI December 18, 1884, page 760.5*

Mark 16:9: "Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils." It would have been strange indeed, if Christ had not shown himself to his disciples as soon as he was risen, in order to comfort them, and to confirm their faith in him. It would be equally strange if the evangelists, whose great aim was to establish the fact of Christ's resurrection, should not mention the particulars connected with it. In this text, again, we have only a simple statement of an incident that might occur on any day. *SITI December 18, 1884, page 760.6*

John 20:19: "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." The remarks on the preceding text will also apply to this. To the plea that the disciples were at this time celebrating the resurrection of Christ on the day which they had resolved to devote to his honor, we reply (1) That this was not a religious meeting, but that the disciples were in their own place of abode (see *Acts 1:13, 14*); (2) They were partaking of their evening meal (see *Luke 24:33; Mark 16:14*); (3) They did not yet believe that Jesus was risen from the dead. After Mary

Magdalene had seen him, “she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not.” *Mark 16:10, 11*. They continued in sorrow and unbelief throughout all that day (*Luke 24:13-17; Mark 12:13*), and did not believe until they saw him for themselves in their room, in the evening of the day of his resurrection. “Then where the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord.” *SITI December 18, 1884, page 760.7*

The six instances of the use of the term the first day of the week are all concerning the particular day on which Christ rose from the dead. If that day that were designed to have any effect upon the practice of the disciples, in regard to the day of rest, these texts must certainly have contained a statement of that fact; but they do not. The evangelists mention the first day of the week in their narrative as a matter of course, and state in the most matter-of-fact manner possible, that the day preceding it is the Sabbath, the Lord's day. We will continue our search. *SITI December 18, 1884, page 760.8*

Acts 20:7: “And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight.” Here is a religious meeting on the first day of the week. Can it be that we have found what we are after? If you say “Aye,” and that the disciples evidently regarded this day as the Lord's day, then we will venture to inquire, By what authority did they so regard it? We have no record of its being exalted to the honor of Lord's day, and we dare not accept any custom without authority. As we have read the text again, however, our enthusiasm ebbs, as we find that it gives no intimation that the day on which they came together had any sacredness whatever. It is simply “the first day of the week.” It is true that they came together to perform a religious act-the breaking the bread-but this act was not confined to any particular day, but was done “every day.” *Acts 2:46*. Our Sunday friends are wont to comfort themselves not a little with the thought that the disciples did hold a meeting on the first day of the week; but they seem to forget that they also held meetings, and that, too, among the heathen, on the seventh day of the week. See *Acts 13:42, 44; 17:2; 18:4, 11*. Thus we have one instance, and *only one*, of a religious meeting on

the first day of the week, and no less than eighty-four meetings on the seventh day of the week. "But," says a friend, "the fact that the disciples worshipped on Saturday proves nothing for Saturday observance, because they held meetings on every day of the week." Exactly so; but if the mere example of the disciples in regularly worshipping on the seventh day, does not prove that day to be the Sabbath, how in the name of reason can a single instance of Sunday worship prove the first day to be the Sabbath?*SITI December 18, 1884, page 760.9*

In considering this text we have not thought it necessary to show that the meeting was on what is known as Saturday night, and that Paul and his companions traveled all the next day, he on foot, and they by sea, although that is the case, and is admitted by many first-day authors. The obvious fact that the day is given no sacred title, and just mentioned, and nothing more, is sufficient to show that we have not yet found what we seek. We will try once more.*SITI December 18, 1884, page 761.1*

1 Corinthians 16:1, 2: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as that given order to the churches in Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings but I come." Well, what have we here? No Lord's day, at any rate. The phrase, "lay by him in store," indicates that the appropriation for the poor was to be done at home. The phrase, "as God hath prospered him," shows that the individual was to look over his accounts to see what his gains had been during the previous week, a work suitable only for a secular day. The fact that it was to be done on a specified time-the first day of the week-shows the duty of system in our offerings to be poor. Dr. Barnes, who most sincerely believed in the sacredness of Sunday, said on this text: "Let him designate a certain portion; let him do this *by himself*, when he is at home, when he can calmly look at the evidence of his prosperity. Let him do it not under the influence of pathetic appeals, or, for the sake of display when he is with others, but let him do it as a matter of principle, and when he is by himself."*SITI December 18, 1884, page 761.2*

"Nor ought we to leave unnoticed the method which he

recommends of laying aside week by week what is devoted to God (1 *Corinthians* 16:2)-a practice equally remote from the excitement of popular appeals and the mere impulse of instinctive benevolence.”-*Conyebeare and Howson.SITI December 18, 1884, page 761.3*

And now, what next? There is nothing more. We have examined every text in the New Testament (eight in all), which mentions the first day of the week, and with what success the reader has seen. Not the shadow of a hint have we found that would show that Sunday has any sacredness.*SITI December 18, 1884, page 761.4*

We have heard it stated from the pulpit, that *Revelation 1:10* must refer to the first day of the week, because the term “Lord’s day” is not elsewhere in the Bible applied to the seventh day. As much as to say, “*Revelation 1:10* cannot refer to Saturday, because that day is nowhere else in the Bible called *Lord’s day*; but it must refer to Sunday, because that day is uniformly called ‘the first day of the week.’” That is a fair specimen of Sunday logic. It is a simple fact, however, as we have already seen (*Exodus 20:8-11; Isaiah 58:13; Mark 2:28*, etc.) that the seventh day of the week is called the Lord’s day.*SITI December 18, 1884, page 761.5*

And here we leave the matter. We have carefully and candidly considered the subject of the Lord’s day, in the light of the Scriptures. As a very brief summary of the whole matter, and to remind the reader of the necessity of making a correct decision, we beg him to read these three texts:*SITI December 18, 1884, page 761.6*

“Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy works; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God.” *Exodus 20:8-10.SITI December 18, 1884, page 761.7*

“If thou want to turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on *my holy* day; and call the Sabbath a delight, all wholly of the Lord honorable; and shalt *honor him* [by keeping the Sabbath as he directs], not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord.” *Isaiah 58:13, 14.SITI December 18, 1884, page*

“For them that honor me I will honor; and they that despise me [by disobedience] shall be lightly esteemed.” ¹ *Samuel 2:30*. E. J. W. *SITI December 18, 1884, page 761.9*

“Punishment of the Wicked” The Signs of the Times, 10, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

DIRECT TESTIMONY

In the preceding articles on the punishment of the wicked, we have confined ourselves principally to a consideration of those texts which are popularly supposed to teach the endless existence of the wicked in torment. We have found that, on the contrary, they teach most emphatically their final utter extinction. Indeed, the strongest proofs in favor of the position which we have taken concerning the future destiny of the impenitent, is to be found in those texts which are generally used by the opponents of that doctrine. We will now proceed to the consideration of a few texts that are so plain that they of themselves should be allowed to settle the question. Some of these we shall quote without comment. *SITI December 18, 1884, page 761.10*

“Fret not thyself because of the evil-doers, neither be thou envious against the workers of iniquity. For they shall soon be *cut down like the grass and wither as the green herb.*” *Psalm 37:1, 2*. *SITI December 18, 1884, page 761.11*

“For evil-doers shall be *cut off*; but those that wait upon the Lord, they shall inherit the earth. For yet a little while and *the wicked shall not be*; yea, thou shalt diligently considered his place, and it shall not be.” *Psalm 37:9, 10*. Compare this with *Obadiah 16*: “For as ye have drunk upon my holy mountain, so shall all the heathen drink continually, yea, they shall drink, and they shall swallow down, and *they shall be as though they had not been.*” We should like to know how these texts can be harmonized with the doctrine of the endless existence of the wicked. That theory cannot be held except by denying these texts, or, what is the same thing, ignoring them. *SITI*

December 18, 1884, page 761.12

“For such as be blessed of him shall inherit the earth; and they that be cursed of him shall be *cut off*.” *Psalm 37:22.SITI December 18, 1884, page 761.13*

“Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter! ... which justify the wicked for reward, and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him! Therefore *as the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust: because they have cast away the law of the Lord of hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel.*” *Isaiah 5:20-24.SITI December 18, 1884, page 761.14*

“And now they sin more and more, and have made them molten images of their silver, and idols according to their own understanding, all of it the work of the craftsmen: they say of them, Let the men that sacrifice kiss the calves. Therefore *they shall be as the morning cloud, and as the early dew that passeth away, as the chaff that is driven with the whirlwind out of the floor, and as the smoke out of the chimney.*” *Hosea 13:2, 3.* Dr. Scott, after quoting this text, says, “*i.e., violently and speedily made to banish and disappear.*” The “Speaker’s Commentary” says of this passage: “The tone of indignant derision passes into that of stern wrath the inflexibility of the purpose to punish is expressed by the accumulation of four several images, all describing utter extermination.” That is just what the language signifies, “utter extermination.” If it does not mean that, we do not see how it can be anything. *SITI December 18, 1884, page 761.15*

The preceding texts have compared the wicked to the most combustible material-stubble and chaff. In the following, the prophet makes the case stronger yet; the wicked are declared to be stubble: -*SITI December 18, 1884, page 761.16*

“For, behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch.” “And ye shall tread down the

wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet in the day that I shall do this, saith the Lord of hosts.” *Malachi 4:1, 3*. With this agree the words of John the Baptist: “Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.” *Matthew 3:12*. *SITI December 18, 1884, page 761.17*

We turn once more to the 37th psalm. In *verse 20* we read: “But the wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lamb; they shall consume; *into smoke* shall they consume away.” The psalmist could have given no illustration of the final destiny of the wicked that would have been more forcible to the minds of the Jews. Every morning and every evening, according to the law, a lamp was placed on the altar and consumed. Beside this, the fact every sin-offering, whether it was a bullock, a goat, or a lamb (*Leviticus 4*), was burned upon the altar. They sought the fat of lambs continually vanishing into smoke, and in that column of the ascending smoke they had an ever-present reminder of the fate of the incorrigibly wicked. They knew that when the fat was placed in that sacrificial fire, it was not preserved, but was speedily destroyed; and so when the psalmist said, “The enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume; and the smoke shall they consume away,” they knew that the fate of the unrepentant sinners would be utter extinction. The last part of the verse only confirms the first clause: “The wicked shall perish;” for as we have already seen, the word “perish” means, “To be destroyed; to go to destruction; to pass away; to come to nothing; to be blotted from existence.” *SITI December 18, 1884, page 761.18*

“Why,” says one, “you are an annihilationist.” Our reply is, We believe what we have just been reading from the Bible; if that is what you call annihilationism, all right; we shall not be frightened from our position, whatever name may be applied to us. This word “annihilation” is a great bug-bear to many. Say they, “It is impossible for a matter to be annihilated.” Now while we should not dare place any limit to God’s power, we do not believe that he will blot out of existence any of the matter which he has created; but that he will and does change the form or combination of parts of many things, we have the most abundant evidence. Webster defines “annihilate” thus: “1. To reduce to nothing; to destroy the

existence of; to cause to cease to be. 2. To destroy the form or peculiar distinctive properties of, so that the specific thing no longer exists, as, to annihilate a forest by cutting and carrying away the trees, though the timber may still exist." The Bible says that the wicked "shall not be;" that "they shall be as though they had not been." There was a time once when they were not; they had no existence; but the matter of which they are composed was even then in existence. So likewise the matter of which they are composed will remain after they cease to be. When the fat was placed on the altar it was destroyed; no one removed it, yet in a little while there was no fat there. What had become of it? It had become smoke. The *fat* was annihilated, if you please; but the matter which had composed it was not. Thus, we are told, will it be with the wicked. If any one disagrees with the statements concerning the wicked, his quarrel is with the Bible, not with us. E. J. W. *SITI December 18, 1884, page 761.19*

